BALM from GILEAD:
OR, THE
DIFFERENCES
ABOUT THE
Indulgence,
Stated and Impleaded:
In a ſober and ſerious
LETTER
TO
Miniſters and Chriſtians in *Scotland.*

By an Healing Hand.

Rom. 16. 17. ----*Mark them which cauſe Diviſions*, &c.
Joh. 17. 11. *Holy Father keep through thine own name thoſe thou haſt given me, that they may be* one *as we are.*

Si in *Neceſſariis* ſervaremus *unitatem*; in *Adiaphoris*, *Libertatem*; in utriſque *charitatem*; quàm multò melius ſe haberent res Eccleſiæ? *Rupert. Melden.* in Præfiſi votiva pro pace Eccl.
A Doctore *glorioſo*, a Paſtore *contentioſo*, & ab *Inutilibus* queſtionibus, liberet Eccleſiam Deus. *Luth.*

LONDON, Printed for *Tho. Cockerill* at the *Three Legs* in the *Poultry*, over againſt the *Stocks-Market*, 1681.

The Printers Advertiſement to the Reader.

Courteous Reader,

THIS enſuing Letter having long lurked in ſome private hands, not communicated to them for whom it has been principally deſigned; Tranſcribing and reading of large Papers being uneaſie, eſpecially to the vulgar, falling now at length into my hand, I do here preſent it to thee in Print, for thy eaſe and profit. I know not the Author, nor does it much concern you or me, Quis dixit, but, Quid dictum. Naked truth will doubtleſs be acceptable to lovers of Truth and Peace, whoever the Herald be that publiſhes it. Nor is it my part to write an Epiſtle Commendatory; all I ſhall ſay is, Tolle & Lege, do but once ſeriouſly, and without a preoccupied mind peruſe it, and read it through, and it is hoped it ſhall not repent you of your labour. You ſee it is an Irenicum, deſigned to caſt water upon theſe unhappy flames, which have burnt up, conſumed and deſtroyed more of the intereſt of Piety in that Land, than Tongue or Pen can expreſs. And ſince our Bleſſed Lord hath ſaid, bleſſed are the Peace-makers, it is expected the children of Peace will not refuſe an ear to the counſels of peace, nor count it an unhappineſs to be charmed by the words of truth and peace here held forth with convincing light, and perſwaſive

power. The Author it ſeems hath not affected to be like ſome, Verborum Mare, Rerum Inane. *Delight will* projicere ampullas, & ſeſquipedalia verba, *to bogle conſciences with big and huſked words; the ſimplicity of the Goſpel ſeems the moſt native and proper dreſs for the Truths of Chriſt. Ye know whoſe character it is, to ſpeak* τὰ ὑπερογκα, 2 Pet. 2. 18. *This Treatiſe being calculated for the capacity of vulgar Chriſtians, yet not below the Genius of the more Learned (both of whoſe conſciences, humours at leaſt, needed cure) has ſtudied rather* fortia, *than* Phalerata, *to be ſound, nervous, ſincere and plain, rather than polite. It is true, none of thoſe dividers, with whom the Author deals, had than unmasked themſelves, nor run to that height of extravagancy, which ſome of late have been carried unto; and therefore all are mildly and modeſtly dealt with. But conſidering the ſtate of the Controverſie, and of the perſons, as* then *it was, and* ſtill (*for moſt part*) *is, it is hoped ye will find this Paper, through the bleſſing of the* Prince of Peace, *not a little uſeful for clearing doubts, compoſing differences, and binding up of wounds. And ſeeing that fire ſtill burneth (and is like to burn all into aſhes) among that poor afflicted remnant, to contribute my mite of help to extinguiſh the ſame, is my aim in letting thee have it in Print. Farewell.*

BALM

BALM FROM GILEAD:

OR AN Admonitory LETTER to the Honeſt Miniſters and People in *Scotland*, *Jan.* 1674.

Reverend Brethren,
and
Chriſtian Friends.

WE ſalute you heartily in the Lord: Grace and Peace, through Jeſus Chriſt be multiplied unto you. And be intreated, we pray you, to allow us liberty to uſe a little freedom with you, being conſtrained in duty to lay ſome things before you, concerning your late Differences, which are like to run to ſuch a lamentable height, and to have ſuch ſad effects, as

may make you the aſtoniſhing wonder as well of your ſelves, as of others. An Addreſs, which we confeſs may ſeem ſtrange, upon divers conſiderations, eſpecially that ſuch as we ſhould preſume to interpoſe with ſuch as you, of whom it becomes us to learn, rather than to warn and admoniſh.

But our Apology is, *Neceſſity has no Law*. Were your Malady like to heal of it ſelf, (as we once expected time ſhould have cooled your Fever, worn out ſuch diſtempers, and not augmented them), or were it tolerable, and not like to be a ſickneſs unto death; or, were others (of whom there are many fitter than we) undertaking the Task, to apply Balm to your bleeding wounds: We ſhould have been glad to have ſtood by, and let better hands deal with you, and we to be joyful ſpectators of your Cure, as we have been, and are ſad witneſſes of your Diſeaſe.

We know alſo how dangerous and thankleſs an office it is (uſually) to meddle with Diviſions; how ready ſuch are (like parters of a Fray) to get the redding-ſtroke, and be divided themſelves, and torn in pieces by thoſe who are moſt out of humour, whether moſt in the right or not, *Act.* 7. 27. Who can meddle with ſuch a flame as is kindled amongſt you, and not burn his face or fingers, even when he caſteth water to quench it? To get behind the hedg, and lye under the wind, were more eaſie and ſecure for us, than to ſtand up in the gap, and offer to pacifie the quarrel; the contentions of Brethren being (like

that

that of the *Ephramites*, Judg. 12. 1.) ſharper and harder to be compoſed than the jars and embroilment of an offended City, *Prov.* 18. 19.

Moreover, true is *Solomons* word, *Prov.*26.17. *He that medleth with ſtrife belonging not unto him, is like one that taketh a dog by the ears.* But, dear Friends, our intereſt in you, and near relation to you, makes that we cannot but think our ſelves concerned: Is not every man called to bring water, and put to his hand to help, when his Neighbours houſe is on fire? Hear us therefore in a few words of ſoberneſs and truth, and let no prejudice or byaſs preoccupy your ear.

Ah! the noiſe of your condition, courſes, and temper, hath come abroad, and filled all ſober and tender hearts with amazement! Serious and ſolid ſpectators wonder what all this ſtir and buſsle among you meaneth; and it putteth them ſadly to enquire thereinto, ſince their concernment in you as fellow-members of the ſame myſtical body calleth them to ſympathize and proffer their help, and not look unconcernedly upon your matters. It is not long ſince we bled for your ſufferings and oppreſſions under the galling yoke, which reared up it ſelf upon the ruins of ſo much of the Lords precious intereſts, and the caſting out and cruſhing of ſo many worthy Miniſters of Chriſt, and haraſſing ſo many godly people for their non-compliance with that courſe of defection. Yet herein we thought you happy, that you found mercy to be faithful, and to keep your integrity, bearing the Croſs with patience, and adhering to the way

of truth, with zeal and constancy; until the Lord should arise and plead for himself, his Altars and People; expecting he would make your patient suffering in due time mollifie the hearts of your Rulers towards you, and be crowned with an happy outgate.

But alas! no sooner find we the Most High extending mercy to you, in granting you some favour in the eyes of Authority, inclining them to relent of the former rigors, and begin to take off restraints under which ye groaned, and lay by almost useless; and to revive the stones out of the rubbish, by granting a liberty to some of your outed Ministers to return to *Jerusalem*, to build the Sanctuary; but alas! soon (almost) we find you splitting among your selves! Behold what heats, ruptures and animosities have broken up among you, like to consume the blessed remnant into ashes! giving your Zion cause to complain, *Behold the wounds that I have received, even in the house of my friends!*

When your first Indulgence was granted, how much was we refreshed to see a *little reviving*, and none of you casting at a day of small things, but rejoicing that any nail was got in the holy place; and none that were in Providence kept still in the Captivity, envying them who in Providence were permitted to return; nor those that were returned, forgetting their Brethren who were detained in *Babylon* behind them, but thirsting, praying, and endeavouring for their delivery. But since a second Indulgence unhappily attended

rended with several Grievances, what dividings and jarrings have arisen! some being free to make use of that liberty, accounting it a mercy that the Legal restraints which debarred them from the publick, free, peaceable exercise of their Ministry, were taken off; and that it was their duty to take hold of the indulged liberty, with a resolution to give Testimony *in their station* against what their acceptance of the same might be lyable to be mistaken in, or be reputed to Homologate of faults in the Magistrate; as also, not to observe any unlawful Injunctions imposed, or to be imposed upon them; judging that thus they wisely separated the precious from the vile, and were obliged to hold fast that which was good, as well as to refuse the evil. Others of you were unclear to make use of the foresaid liberty, some upon one account, some upon another; of which hereafter.

And had your different apprehensions of that matter been managed with sobriety and moderation, and no soul-wasting and Church-ruining contests been raised thereabout; but God waited upon, and mutual forbearance exercised, till your different measures of light had come to some happy accommodation; Blessed had ye been, *Psal.* 133. 1, 2. And some, we grant, yea a good many, have obtained mercy to do so.

But others, alas! have carried otherwise, not contenting themselves to enjoy and follow their own light, have also laid, and still lay sore at those who differ from them. What woful heart-burnings, rentings, alienations, fierce and fiery clamours,

clamours, and pitiful confuſions, are fallen in among you! as if a judicial ſpirit of Diviſion were poured out upon you, (ah! the anger of the Lord hath divided them! and will he no more regard them?) Which who can look upon, and not be pained at the very heart with ſorrow! Who can hold their peace at ſuch a doleful thing! Whoſe tongue would not looſe, as *Cræſus* his Son's did, in a like caſe, and cry, *Spare!* Underſtanding therefore ſuch exorbitant heats and extravagant courſes to be in ſome of you againſt others, meerly for their following their light in uſe-making of that Licenſe to exerciſe the Miniſtry which they have and hold of the Lord; Albeit we may not preſume to be *Palæmon* or Umpire betwixt you, yet (judging the part of a Monitor not incompetent unto us) we cannot but interpoſe, and with the tear in our eye, cry, *What mean ye to fall at ſuch odds!*

Dear Brethren! Can there be no *difference* among you without *diviſion?* no *diverſity* of apprehenſions of things without running into *Parties* and *conteſts* about them? Is difference of judgment in every leſſer thing, inconſiſtent with unity and peace, concord and communion in things wherein ye are aggrieved? And may ye not be of one heart, till ye be of one way in things wherein ye differ? Muſt ye caſt out and contend, when ye cannot all be of the ſame mind, in ſuch *inferiour* things, albeit ye agree in the *Main?* Are ye not united in Doctrine, Worſhip, *Principles* of Diſcipline and Government? and will ye rent at ſuch a rate about the *Application*

of

of one principle to a particular caſe? Will ye fall out among your ſelves, while ye are jointly ingaged in one common cauſe againſt a common adverſary, who watcheth for your halting, and ſaith of your jarrings, *Aha! ſo would we have it!* Have ye forgotten the former Perſecution, that ye are ſo ſoon fallen by the ears among your ſelves? Are ye not under their eye, who rejoice at the ſport, clap hands and cry, *Hui* to the fray? Could ye gratifie them, and diſadvantage your ſelves more than by ſuch reelings? Is not this that which their very ſouls longed for? and now you grant them their deſire, as *Lam.* 2. 15, 16. You are riven with a wedg of your own timber, whom all the enemies fury could not undo! Are ye not become the ſcorn of the Adverſary, the ſhame and ſorrow of your friends? *Ah! tell it not in Gath*, &c. How much alſo of the indignation of the Lord doth Schiſmatizing import? What fatal judgments doth it portend? *Jer.* 13. 13, 14. And what a ſcandal is it to ſee the Sons of Peace, as it were, *intoxicated* with the waters of *Maſſah* and *Meribah*? Will not this be *Marah*, bitterneſs in the end? Is it not your great plague to be thus disjointed, *Iſa.* 9. 19—21? Were it not your rich bleſſing to be compoſed, and unite, for the better following of common duties, *Iſa.* 11. 13, 14? And will not your foes carefully improve ſuch advantages againſt you? And being broken among your ſelves, are ye not become weak and contemptible, and expoſe your ſelves a prey to all the beaſts

Hoc Ithacus velit, & magno mercentur Atridæ.

beasts of the field that please to devour? And utterly incapacitate your selves for Duty or Outgeate? What will probably become of such a distracted divided company; crumbled into so many Atoms and Fractions? Yea, Subdivisions and new debates starting daily, fra once Division beginneth, being like the letting forth of water, breaches multiplying and waxing wider and wider, *Prov.* 17. 14. What will this sickness terminate into? We need no *Galen* nor *Hypocrates* to foretel its event. A wiser than they, telleth us, *A Kingdom divided against it self cannot stand.* May ye not remember your last rupture, how the wild Boar of Devastation came in at that gap over all your bellies, which might have been prevented, had not your renting opened a door for it, and incapacitated you to oppose it? and what may come in at this, is not hard to foresee! Is not Popery, that devouring Leviathan, at your gates, ready to be ushered in by it? Was not *Hannibal ad Portas*, a strange alarm to the *Romans* to lay by their private jars, and unite against their common danger? And will no such hazard induce you to let alone your intestine embroilments? Will neither by-past experience (the School-master of very fools) nor present fears and peril warn you? Will ye still dash upon that Rock on which the Church of Christ hath so oft split, and God hath set up so many Beacons of his Displeasure? Shall Schism be again the bane and blemish of the *Presbyterian* party; and your comely parity be any more like the mother of confusion, and so the way of God be

be evil ſpoken of through you? Or, Is this the way for the Goſpel's proſpering? Can they be excellent Architects, who build the Lords houſe by firing it, or pulling it in pieces? Or, Theſe good Chirurgeons who know no other method or means to heal, but by Diſlocation, Amputation, or other the like dogged Cures? Is this the mean to make Chriſts Kingdom and Crown flouriſh, by ſetting his faithful Friends and Subjects at variance? Did ever Religion indeed thrive by ſuch dividings and ſtrivings of Miniſters or People? Is not Diviſion always diſtempering, and the very Moth and Canker-worm of the life of Piety? Look, whatever Religion ſeemeth to gain in a parcel, doth it not loſe much more in the Bulk, in a factious time? And how much *Profeſſion* enlargeth her Phylacteries, *Practice*, Power, Life, and Tenderneſs, abateth as much in reality: See *Pſal.* 122. *v.* 7. *James* 3. 16. Verily the miſchief of dividing is unſpeakable.

Again, Are ye not Brethren? and the *Canaanite* and the *Perizite* in the Land? And will ye yet contend in the very face of the Enemy, and Jaws of devouring-like danger? *Will ye not ceaſe your Animoſities, till the Popiſh Sword end the quarrel?* Will ye be like thoſe of *Jeruſalem* in the Siege, waſting and weakning your ſelves by furious inteſtine Conflicts, while the Roman Enemy lyeth about your Walls, ready to ſwallow you up both? Or like diſtracted Mariners falling by the ears together, while the ſwelling Sea and raging Storm is like to ſink the Ship and you both? (Oh how fatal-like and demented!) Moreover, Is not Schiſm a breach of

your

your Covenant, as well as Prelacy? abjured with that ſame breath wherewith ye renounce it and Popery? And will ye cry out of others for breach of Covenant, and yet violate the ſame ſo groſly your ſelves? Be aſtoniſhed, O Heaven! and tremble thou Earth! to ſee men ſo careful to run from one evil, and ſo little tender to hold off another? What, are there no healing Medicines, nor healing men among you? None to ſtand in the Gap? Can there be no accommodating your differences? Is your Breach wide as the Sea? your wound incurable? Does any of you think it their glory to blow the Bellows, and to be ambitious who ſhall act higheſt in oppoſition one to another? Then ſhall our Soul weep in ſecret for your miſery, and ſoon may your Fate be read, *Hoſ.* 10. 2. *Their Heart is divided, now ſhall they be found faulty:* Rent, and Ruin, *Pſal.* 55. 9. Dividers are certainly Subverters; and will ye burn down the Sanctuary into Aſhes, while ye pretend to defend and uphold it? Ah, how is almoſt every Bottle filled, not with Wine and ſtrong drink, but a reeling Spirit mingled in, to make them ſtagger and fall? Are they not like a wild Bull in a Net, full of the fury of the Lord, and of the rebuke of their God? How may here our Pen ſtop, and our eye trickle down with Tears!—— Ah Tragedy beyond Lamentation! —— What ſhall we do for our little Siſter with her cancered Breaſts?

Yet the Moſt High is to be bleſſed, that the ſolid, godly, grave, and experienced of you, are not for fomenting, but for ſopiting and quaſhing the differences. But oh! the heat and inconſiderate-

neſs

neſs of the unſolid, unſtudied, younger ſort, and a few eager of the Elder! What unbridled intemperancy of Tongue and Actions ſtand they guilty of, before the Lord! And may not every ſober Perſon ſay, what *Jacob* left for *Levi*'s Legacy, *Gen.* 49. 7. *Wo is us for their Anger, for it is fierce; and their wrath, for it is cruel! O our Soul, come not thou into their ſecret, and unto their Aſſembly our Honour be not thou united!* What will ſuch diſtractions reſolve into at laſt, if the Healer of the Nations prevent it not? See *Gal.* 5. 15. *If ye bite and devour one another, take heed ye be not conſumed one of another.* Will ye be like the fooliſh Knights of *Cadmus*, who never ceaſed Fighting among themſelves, while there were any to maintain the quarrel?

We mean not by this to diſparage any's zeal and good affection, but the prepoſterous, irregular, immoderate proſecutions of that zeal, which ſome ſeem to be tranſported in, we cannot approve, *Gal.* 4. 17, 18. We doubt if ſuch of you as are moſt buſie and greateſt ſticklers in ſuch an unhappy buſineſs, will find neither thanks or reward from the Prince of Peace, *Pſal.* 105. 14, 15. But happy they who being perſecuted, ſuffer it; being defamed, intreat; and ſtudy by patience, meekneſs, and long-ſuffering, to conquer their Brethren, and to bring them to a better underſtanding together, rather than to meet humour with humour, heat with heat, railing with railing, *&c.* Such are likeſt their ever bleſſed Lord, 1 *Pet.* 2. 23.

It is ſaid, theſe quiet indulged men are not ſuch Dunces, but they could well repay their Antagoniſts; but (whatever diſadvantage they lye at otherwiſe)

therwiſe) yet in this they ſeem to have the advantage, that while others are for War, they are for Peace, *(Pſal.* 120. 6, 7.) They ſeek peace and purſue it, they follow theſe their angry Brethren with love, while they run from them; they pray for them, ſome of whom to their power perſecute them, *(Jer.* 18. 20.) and inſtead of holding up Debates, they love rather to let them fall for peace-ſake, and to give their Backs to the Smiters, and their Cheeks to them that pluck off the Hair, and hide not their Face from ſhame and ſpitting; counting nothing dear to them, ſo they may finiſh their courſe with fruitfulneſs, and fulfil the Miniſtry they have received of the Lord.

But, dear Friends, could ye give us leave (and not take it ill) to uſe a little freedom with you, we would humbly adventure to proffer a word of Advice to you all, which perhaps may be not unſeaſonable at ſuch a juncture.

Firſt of all, *Study Reconciliation with God.* We fear your breach among your ſelves has begun here at diſtance with God; you eſpecially hath he known beyond others, and therefore will not let you go unpuniſhed. What higher provocations are there, than thoſe of Sons and Daughters? And what ſorer ſcourge can there be, than to be left of him to bite and devour one another? By this means ye do the Biſhops work, and the Papiſts work, to their hands: Now ye ſee nothing will unite you, till ye unite in God; a common cauſe and common intereſt will not unite you, a Furnace will not unite you, no Bonds will cement you, until ye be One in him who is the Corner-Stone, in whom

whom both sides of the Building meet.

II. *Get more of the power of Grace into your hearts, and walk in his fear.* Did Grace, not humour predominate, and the fear of God awe you, durst some take the latitude they do? Get heart-distempers (the cause of heart-delusions) purged away. Mortifie pride and self-conceit (the usual fault of men of parts, 1 *Cor.* 8. 2. and the snare of Novices, 1 *Tim.* 3. 6. yet the usual Makebait of contention, *Prov.* 13. 10.) As also passion, peevishness, male-contentedness, self-seeking, peremptoriness, *&c.* (which are not seldom incident to sufferers), and all other dividing-corruptions, lay them aside; and get Love, humility, sobriety, meekness, moderation, self-denial, and such like uniting Graces to possess your hearts and minds. It is our Lords advice, *Mark* 9. 50. *Have salt in your selves, and peace one with another.* What is it but the corruptions, not the Graces of good men, which maketh them jar? see *Jam.* 4. 1. 1 *Cor.* 3. 3, 4. Let therefore your furnace refine you, and purge away your dross; be not the boiling pot, retaining the scum; homogeneous things unite easily and well.

III. *Study the practice of that excellent duty of mutual forbearance:* Read *Eph.* 4. 2, 3. *Gal.* 6. 1, 2. *Col.* 3. 12, 13. and seriously ponder what there is inculcated by the wisdom of God. Do not censure, nor rigidly strain or wrest one anothers words or deeds, commenting and putting glosses upon them, or wringing consequences from them (as prejudice useth to do, 1 *Cor.* 13. 5, 6.) which they never dreamed of, nor is there per-

haps native ground for, *Prov.* 30. 33. *Pſal.* 56. 5. Backbite not one another, talk not of one anothers failings, real or ſuppoſed, (*Tit.* 3. 2. *Jam.* 4. 11.) but pity and pray over them, *Gal.* 6. 1. Chuſe rather to weep in ſecret for the ſame, than to tell them for news. Ye know *Conſtantine* the Great, his famous word and deed at the Council of *Nice*, when delations and complaints were preferred to him by the Miniſters one of another, *I had rather*, ſaid he, *hide a Miniſters fault with my Robe, than eliminate them*; and accordingly he burn'd their Libels and Accuſations, for the Goſpels ſake. O let love cover (1 *Pet.* 4. 8.) and not carnal zeal divulge, much leſs coin faults and miſreports one of another. What would ye give the Adverſaries leave to do but to make you odious with ſlanders, that your Cauſe may ſtink, and your name rot above the ground? And ſhall any of you (as ſome do) take that trade off their hand, blaſting (ſo far as they can) every bodies Reputation not of their way? Is this the Spirit of the Lord? Are theſe his Doings? See *Jam.* 3. 14, 15. *Pſal.* 50. 19, 20. *Gal.* 5. 21, 22, 23. *Luk.* 54. 55. Is this acceptable ſervice to the Prince of Paſtors? ſee *Numb.* 12. 8, 9, 10. *Wherefore were ye not afraid to ſpeak againſt my ſervant Moſes, ſays the Lord, &c.* Weigh alſo, *Pſal.* 120. 3, 4. Is *Shimei*'s vice now become a virtue? would it not become you better, in Chriſtian tenderneſs faithfully to admoniſh one another, than by word or writing in publick or private to traduce and load one another with Legends of falſe ſtories, and groundleſs miſtakes?

and

and yet what greater engine is used by some to breed and feed your Differences, than this artifice? *Prov.* 16. 28. But will not wo be to them who widen breaches by evil whispers, and cunning surmises? *Prov.* 6. 14. Much more sin they, who dare preach such things for the Oracles of God.

IV. *Fall into serious dislike of Divisions*, as most of all your grave and solid, tender and serious Ministers and Christians abhor them. Know the sin and evil of them, what bitter fruits and sad consequences they are of. O! read carefully what these excellent Divines have written (from experience) upon that subject, who bleeding over the Churches wounds in their time, did essay in love to lay out the sore, and furnish cure: namely famous *Paræus* in his *Irenicum*, and learned *Junius* upon *Psal.* 133. But if over-Sea Divines writings seem strangers to you, read some of those at home, specially Judicious and Holy Mr. *Durham* your Country-man, in the last part of his excellent Treatise of *Scandal*; and Godly Mr. *Burroughs* your Neighbour, in his Treatise of *Heart-Divisions*. Read, consider, and lay to heart what these *Chrysostoms* of their age, have by their Golden mouths and Silver pens delivered against dividings, and see if ye will dare to make light of rentings any more. ——— Godly men may for a time through infirmity and tentation be led upon that snare, (O sad snare!) as *Act.* 15. 39. *Luk.* 9. 49, 50. yet it is not the better for that: It is their infirmity, not their duty, even to be in the least overtaken with it;

but of what untender (not to say deboshed) Consciences must they be, who (like *Salamanders*) take pleasure in the fire, and love to kindle or inflame the combustion? *Prov.* 6. 14, 15, 16, 19. Is it not sad when some who seem strict and tender in other things, yet are nothing tender of renting the seamless Coat of Christ, and take a strange liberty to accuse and calumniate their Brethren? Did ye ponder the woful evil and mischief of such practices, we think ye would abhor them little less than the sacrificing to the *Dagon* of *Rome!* And yet alas, how prone are some to pride themselves in such untowardly ways, as if it were a piece of Religion, yea the *Shibboleth* and *Culmen* of Honesty! thus glorying in their shame!——We know, and all *Israel* may know the certainty of these sad things; We are not such strangers to your *Israel*, but we have seen of your bitter Papers, and otherwise had good information of some's strange *Anomalies*, wherein we have wondered to see them so transported with prejudice and passion (as *Saul* was in his zeal against the *Gibeonites*) unto speeches and practices which might have made any sober and tender heart break in pieces.

If any *say*, May and ought we not to testifie against the corruption which we suppose to be in the Indulgence? And if others say, may not we defend that which we suppose to be a lawful liberty, against all attackers of it? We *confess*, we hear not much Din of any defences, as if the Indulged trusted so much to the merits of their cause, that they think its own Innocency might bear

bear it out, and therefore resolved by patience and prayer to wait on God, until he bring forth their Righteousness as the light, *&c.* But all the noise we hear, is of impugning them, Axes and Hammers breaking down that restored piece of the carved work, as many take it to be.

Wherefore in order to your bearing Testimony, might we adventure without your offence to advise you, we would humbly offer these three things to be considered: (1) *Be sure it be a sin before ye appear against it*; lest ye condemn Truth and Duty instead of error and sin. And in this, remember ye must not too much indulge your own notions, nor every light scruple, which though they may *suspend* you from *approving*, yet may prove too weak a ground for *condemning*, see *Rom.* 14. 3, 23. and how groundlesly did those contend with *Peter*, in *Act.* 11. 1? What if you be in a mistake as those were? Consult therefore the Oracles of God; hear what your Brethren has to say for themselves; and condemn nothing peremptorily but what the Scripture evidently condemneth; and in intricate and debateable points (which are controverted even amongst the learned, godly, and orthodox) be not rash and positive in condemning all that are not of your mind. Let the Church define and determine the Controversie before ye conclude any thing peremptorily about it, as to the judging of others; and that part of the question which they own, what ye are unclear in, and boggle at, forbear to practice it your selves; but condemn not others who are not of the same appre-

 hensions,

henſions, *Rom.* 14. 13. what if your unclearneſs be your infirmity? ſhall your infirmity warrant you to cenſure others perfection?

(2) Being once ſure the thing is a fault, *Be ſure alſo your Brethren be guilty thereof*, before ye condemn them for it. What if they be innocent of that you charge upon them? Think not jealouſies, whiſpers, or uncharitable conſtructions, and raſh and rigid Imputations, or far-fetched, and not certain conſequences, ſufficient to fix guilt upon them. How did *Jobs* Friends thus miſtake him, and raſhly condemn him as wicked, and but an hypocrite, and many a threatning (true in the general) did they miſapply to him in particular? and ſo their diſpute and arguments were like Arrows ſhot at rovers, miſſing the mark, by miſtaking him for the man he was not. Thus innocency often ſuffers ſadly upon miſtake. Whence the Reformed Divines complain of it as a great injuſtice done them by their Adverſaries, That ſuch and ſuch odious *Dogmata* of Doctrines, which their ſoul abhors, ſhould be imputed unto them, and faſtened upon them as theirs, which are denied by them, yet gathered (by their Adverſaries) by ſome ſort of probable-like conſequences, from Principles which they hold: Even as ye do charge your Brethren with Eraſtianiſm, and Communion with the Kings tranſcendent Supremacy, *&c.* while yet they diſclaim theſe as much as ye do, only by ſome remote and violent conſequences ye would infer it from their practice of accepting the indulged liberty. *Nihil injuſtius* (ſaith *Mareſius*, loc. 17. §. 13.)

§. 13.) *quam alicui imputare tanquam illius Dogma*, (add *vel praxiu*) *id quod ipso deteſtatur expreſſe, eo quod, non evidente, proximâ, & neceſſariâ, conſequentiâ, ſed longe petitis Argutiolis, putes te id ex ejus placitis* (*vel praxi*) *confecturum.* All ſober men condemn this as a dividing Principle, and a moſt iniquous practice. See Learned *Davenant* in his *Sententia de pace inter Evangelicos procuranda*, pag. 65. And *Burroughs* in his *Irenicum*, *pag.* 185. What are your racked Inferences, forced Imputations, and ſtrained miſconſtructions, but fancies of your own brains? not the real guilt of your Brethren? which *Chimera*'s when ye impugn, ye but fight with your own ſhadow. And what are your uncertain *Hiſtoriolæ*, Tittle-tattle's, and groundleſs ſurmiſes of your Brethrens practices, but a ſandy-foundation to build the weight of ſuch heavy charges upon, as much of that guilt is ye charge upon them? O let never your zeal and witneſs-bearing run at random, and flie at a venture.

(3) Suppoſe ye be clear both *in Queſtione juris*, and *in Queſtione facti*, *i. e.* ſuppoſe the thing evil, and them guilty, yet let your zeal and witneſs-bearing againſt it *keep due proportion*; and not exceed the bounds of ſobriety. Sure ye may, and ſhould teſtifie againſt it in all due ways, manner and meaſure; yet how will that juſtifie irregular and exorbitant courſes of oppoſition? or allow you to over-do or divide? May it not ſuffice you to do that in your ſtation which ſerveth to exonerate your Conſciences, and deliver your ſoul from the guilt of acceſſion? But muſt

ye over-ſtretch and go beyond your line and meaſure? Go tell the indulged your thoughts of it, in ſeriouſneſs and love plead with them, expoſtulate, obteſt them. But think not that every fault, real or ſuppoſed in them, will be found before God or man a relevant ground to warrant contention, ſeparation and diviſion from them. If ye over-do, ye may undo; and your right ſide (as ye take it to be) become the wrong ſide by miſmanagement. Do ye think there can be no ſinful exceſs of heat, violence and diſorder, in proſecuting a good cauſe? ſo no leſs than *Jehu*'s furious march ſufficient to exonerate you? Is there no golden mediocrity betwixt fiery zeal and *Laodicean* luke-warmneſs? Did not worthy *Luther* once ſpoil his cauſe much by over-acting, and exceſs of fervour? Let right things be done in a right manner. And know, that notwithſtanding the right were upon your ſide, the guilt and blame of the diviſion may nevertheleſs be yours; for, even truth and righteouſneſs may be factiouſly and indiſcreetly pleaded and contended for, as in *Act.* 15. 39. *Job* 13. 4, 7, 8. If ye think and lay it down for a principle, that every thing ye conceive to be evil, is to be oppoſed and impugned to the yondmoſt extremity and renting, and nothing ſuppoſed amiſs is to be tolerated and forborn for the good of the Goſpel, for peace and unities ſake, ye may ſee that abundantly confuted by Mr. *Burroughs* in his *Irenicum*, Chap. 8, & 9. but eſpecially by your moſt grave, wiſe, tender and faithful Mr. *Durham* in his Book of *Scandal*, *Part* 3. *Chap.* 8.

Con-

Confine your ſelves therefore within the juſt bounds of holy zeal, and think it no lukewarmneſs to be ſober; and many of your extravagancies will hereby be cut off.

V. *Conſider in ſober ſadneſs, what cauſe is there for all your outcry?* What has theſe indulged men done, that ye rate them, and perſecute them more largely and briskly than ye do any of the other? What is the quarrel? your edgineſs againſt them would make the world believe they were monſters of men, and have committed ſome horrible iniquity in going to feed the flocks of God, to which people called them, and the Magiſtrate granted them his Legal leave. Why, what crime is this? Ye debacchat againſt them, and yet when we ſearch into the matter, we can find no ſuch ground of ſtumbling at them; being in their Qualifications not the meaneſt of your party; in their lives holy and blameleſs, in their Miniſtry faithful and painful lovers of truth and peace, piety and purity.

And for their ſimple taking occaſion of the Magiſtrates grant of Civil Liberty to return to their charges, or to officiate and ſupply in another vacant place, being called thereunto by the people, until God ſhould open a door of regreſs to their former charges, we wonder what fault this ſhould be thought!

Whether is it better to Preach with the Magiſtrates good leave, or without it? Seeing both thoſe ways of Preaching differ only in circumſtances, which of the two are moſt deſirable, judg ye. When God makes him do the work of a Nurſe-Father

ther ſo far, as to permit and allow them the free exerciſe of the Miniſtry, which they have of Chriſt Jeſus their Lord and Maſter; does the Prince his civil Licenſe vitiate their Miniſtry, or make it uncleanly, even to that height (as ſome in their Paroxiſms drive it) that they may not be heard nor owned, but rejected and ſeparated from, as the height of Abominations? Is the exerciſe of their Function the worſe, that the liberty thereof is not taken at their own hand? We hope none of you do, nor will allow your ſelves to think ſo; therefore ye will do well to take heed, that your juſt offence at the Magiſtrates faults in other things, do not diminiſh your reſpect to the Ordinance of God, (*viz.* that juſt Right and Authority he is clothed with) and unjuſtly prejudge you at the lawful Acts and Favours thereof; and while ye diſlike the abuſe of his power, ſtumble not at the right uſe thereof. Shall any think nothing pleaſeth now, but what is croſs the grain of Authority? We doubt not but Miniſters have a Right to Preach, and in ſome caſes may and muſt make uſe of that Right, even when the Magiſtrate denies his permiſſion: yet is it not much more deſirable to have his leave than to want it? Specially when the peaceable Preaching of the Goſpel is not feaſible without it, becauſe of Legal Reſtraints backed with force, as was their caſe. Does not the Lord himſelf direct *Moſes* (*Exod.* 3. 18. with 5. 1, 3.) to deſire leave even of *Pharaoh*, to let *Iſrael* to go and Sacrifice to their God in the Wilderneſs, *Let my People go, that, &c.* Not that their Liberty did depend abſolutely and *Quo ad jus ad rem*, or in point of Right, upon *Pharaoh's*

Pharaoh's good will; but such respect would the Lord put upon the Magistrates leave, though a Tyrant and Oppressor: And to teach all men how desirable it is, to have the permission and allowance of Authority to the free exercise of Religion, if it can be obtained; therefore would the Lord have this liberty intreated for. And did not *Moses* and all *Israel* accept this Liberty when it was granted? *Exod.* 12.31. Or did any blame him for seeking and accepting it? It is true this Liberty was full as to Persons and Things, *Moses* being specially appointed of God *not to leave one hoof behind, nor a little one*, nor to sacrifice *in the Land*, *Exod.* 8. 25, 26, 27. *Exod.* 10. 8, 9. *Exod.* 10. 24, 25, 26. yet that does not say, but others may accept of a more narrow Liberty, till they get more; not having such peremptory Injunctions and Reasons for the contrary, as *Moses* had, as hereafter shall be made to appear, nor being in *possessorio*, as He and *Israel* was, and therefore was not to quit one hoof; but you are in *petitorio*, as *Esdras* was, and the Children of the Captivity, and therefore may take what ye can get till more come, which is no quitting of what is not received, as afterwards shall be evinced. However, this Instance proveth that the Magistrates civil permission is no blemish, but a desirable mercy to the publick, solemn, free Exercise of Religion, Ministry and Ordinances; and the more full the Liberty be, the better it is; whence also it followeth, that a snatch, a parcel of that Liberty cannot be in it self sinful, being all of one *kind*, though differing in *Measure and Degree*.

Moreover,

Moreover, See how *Paul* did obteſt the very Heathen Governour for this Favour; *Acts* 21. 39. *I beſeech thee* (ſays he) *ſuffer me to ſpeak to the People:* And when he gave him *Licenſe*, he made uſe of it and Preached. We ſhould not think it a fault in you, to beg ſuch a Liberty upon your knees, much leſs to take it when offered; and did not *Paul* (*Acts* 28. 30, 31.) Preach for ſome years at *Rome*, upon a *Negative* Permiſſion, *no man forbidding him*, *viz.* neither Emperour nor Senate, *&c.* as is there marked? And *Acts* 26. 1. upon a *Poſitive* Permiſſion, he not only Apologized, but Preached to *Agrippa*. Now, ſurely, if to Preach Occaſionally upon ſuch a Warrant, be not ill, neither can it be to Preach in a more ſtated way (as your Brethren do) upon a ſtated permiſſion.

And who can deny, but that *Cyrus*, *Darius*, and *Artaxerxes*, their Grants of Liberty (recorded by *Eſdras*) to go up to *Jeruſalem*, and build the Houſe of the Lord, and offer Sacrifice, *&c.* there, was a mercy, and more valuable than for the Children of the Captivity to have gone up and done this at their own hand? And is this your like piece of Liberty, though of a leſſer ſize, not at all to be embraced? What would the Proteſtants in *Hungary* and *Spain* eſteem of the like favour?

Further, Did not your ſelves generally allow of the firſt Indulgence? counted it an hopeful beginning of good to your poor afflicted Church? (as can be atteſted.) How come ye then now to controvert it? And would ye not yet (as is informed) accept of a general Indulgence? much more of a complete Reſtauration of the Church to her former Integrity?

Integrity? And is it ſuch a ſin to take part of that Liberty, till God put it into the heart of the Magiſtrate to grant more? Doth *magis & minus variare ſpeciem*? Will ye either have all or nothing, and deſpiſe a day of ſmall things? (contrary to the Saints humble and good way of old, *Eſdras.* 3. *v.* 10, 11. and 9. 8, 9.) And will ye caſt at the *kind*, becauſe of defect in the *meaſure*?

Add to this, that ye did all unanimouſly ſubmit to the Magiſtrates outing you of your Charges, by his baniſhing you therefrom, as *Solomon* did *Abiathar* (though here it was juſt, but in your caſe undeſerved.) Now, ſith this was the exerciſe of a privative power about the matters of God, and conſequently near in kin to that Papal Supremacy which ye ſo ſtumble at; ſtrange it is to find you opponing againſt this Grant of Indulgence, which is but an Act of his Cumulative or Auxiliary Power, like a Nurſe-father, opening the door again which he had formerly ſhut. Ye know that Dictate of Natures light, *Ejus eſt Reſtituere, Cujus eſt Deſtituere*, without doubt much more rightfully may he Licenſe you to return to your Watch-Towers, than beat you from them; and more laudably may ye ſubmit to the one than to the other. If ye ſay, It was your fault to ſubmit to his ejecting you, and therefore no Argument can be drawn from it to allow his Reponing you: Beſide that, herein ye condemn your ſelves, and the reſt of the Generation of the Righteous in *Scotland*, *England*, and *Ireland*; and much may be ſaid from Scripture and Reaſon, to juſtifie that ſubmiſſion; we humbly beg further to be informed, If ye repent of it, where is your Confeſſion?

Confeſſion? and where are the Fruits of your Repentance? Why do you not go to your charges again, but perſiſt in ſubmiſſion to your Ejection?

But to come nearer the purpoſe: What is it diſpleaſeth you at your Brethrens deed?

I. Is it the *Name* of *Indulgence*? *Anſw.* We hope ye will not contend about Names and Words, 1 *Tim.* 6. 4. Were not ſuch Litigations a bogling at Shadows? and would ſavour of Levity or Captiouſneſs? What is ſuch an Indulgence, but a diſpenſing with the ſeverity of the Law, letting them have acceſs to the publick, peaceable exerciſe of their Miniſtry, from which the Law did debar them? And may not the Magiſtrate diſpenſe with his own Law, in whole or in part, and call this very properly an Indulgence? But away with ſtriving about words! Call it a Permiſſion, Toleration, or Licenſe, or what ye will, ſo ye but agree about the thing.

II. Does it offend you that the Magiſtrate Intermedleth with Church-affairs? *Anſw.* We expect alſo this not to be your ſcruple; judging ye ſtill adhere to the Doctrine of your Church, and of all the Reformed, expreſſed in their Confeſſions of Faith, and the Writings of their Worthies againſt the Papiſts, Anabaptiſts, and Eraſtians; who (tho' againſt Eraſtians) they deny the Magiſtrate any power *in Sacris*, or formally and intrinſecally Eccleſiaſtical, called in Scripture *the Power of the Keys*, yet (againſt the Papiſts and Anabaptiſts) they attribute unto him an Imperative Power *circa ſacra*, about the matters of God, formally civil, and only objectively Eccleſiaſtical, and to be put forth

mode

modo civili, in a civil way, and by civil means: so that there is nothing so sacred in the visible matters of Religion, but it is the object of his care and Procuratorship, and his power to be conversant about it, in manner competent, (as *Amesius* tells, *Cas. const. lib.* 5. *cap.*25. *thes.* 8.) He being *custos & vindex utriusq; tabulæ*, keeper of both Tables of the Law, of the first as well as of the second, as the fourth Command appointeth; whence it is called by some eminent Divines, the Magistrates *Charter* for taking care of Religion; which is also confirmed from *Deut.*31. 9. & *Deut.* 17. 18, 19. with *Josh.*11. 7, 8, 9. This power, and by virtue of it, his just intermedling for the good of Religion, is uncontroverted by Orthodox Divines, and confirmed by that applauded practice of *Artaxerxes*, Decreeing, *Ezra* 7.23. *Whatsoever is commanded by the God of Heaven, let it be diligently done for the House of the God of Heaven, &c.* Which power (if through error or wickedness) the Magistrate imploy for the hurt, rather than for the good of the Church, (though that be a fault) yet we judg ye will not call it Erastianism, or an usurpation of an unlawful power, but an abuse or misapplication of a lawful; and will count him peccant in the *matter*, not in the *Authority* or power.

Now this power of his is extended by Divines to no less, if not to more, than your Indulgence (in so far as it is accepted by the Brethren) amounts unto. And that, conform to the word of God in the commended practices of several Kings mentioned in Scripture, who warrantably

took

took upon them by vertue of their calling to do as much and more, without the least imputation of invading the Priestly or Spiritual power; *Aarons* Rod, and *Judahs* Scepters, remaining still distinct notwithstanding. Particularly, did not *Hezekiah* in 2 *Chron.* 29. 3. *Open the doors of the house of the Lord*, which had been shut for a long time, as *v.*7. and *v.*4. it is said, *He brought in the Priests and Levites.*——And *v.* 5. he *puts* them to their work, *to sanctifie and cleanse the house.* And *v.* 21. *To offer sacrifices is commanded* by him.——And *v.*25. he *set* (or restored to their place) *the Levites in the house of the Lord with Cymbals, &c.* And *v.*30. *Commanded them to sing praise*, &c. Now in all these things the Priests and Levites did give obedience not only out of *duty to God*, as obliged to do these things by vertue of their *office*, but also out of *respect to the Kings Commandment*, as ye find *v.* 15, 24. The like is said, 2 *Chron.* 35. 2. that *Josias* set the *Priests* in their *Charges.* From these Citations Note three things:

(1) That as it is proper to the Spiritual Officers of the House of God *Operari in Sacris*, or *elicitively* to act in the exercises of Religion; so it is not incompetent to the Civil Ruler to *command*, and put forth his authority about the same *imperatively*, but *jure* he *may*, yea *ex Officio* he *ought* to do so; even to put the Church-Officers to their duty and work, when need requireth; and that not only by removing Restraints and Impediments, nor by naked permission only, but even by way of Authoritative order and com-

command. As there, the Prince appointeth, and the Prieſt acteth.

(2) That this is eſpecially competent, yea incumbent to him, *In ſtatu Eccleſiæ Turbato, vel corrupto*, in a perturbed or corrupted ſtate of the Church, ſuch as then was, and as yours was and is.

(3) That it is no crime for the Miniſters of the Lord to obey the Magiſtrate in ſuch a caſe. As the Magiſtrate acteth no Eraſtianiſm, nor Papal Supremacy in this kind of doing; ſo neither does the Miniſter homologate or involve himſelf in any ſuch crime, nor is to be loaded with ſuch Imputations in and for going along (in his place) with ſuch appointments of the Magiſtrate. However *Uzziah* was faulty in the one ſort (as 2 *Chron.* 26. 16, 18.) and *Jeroboam* in the other ſort of ſoleciſms in the exerciſe of Magiſtratical power about Religion, (as 1 *King.* 12. 28, 29, 31, 32, 33.) *Uzziah* invading the Prieſts Office, like an Eraſtian indeed, and *Jeroboam* uſurping that unlawful Supremacy like Lord and Head of the Church; yet good *Hezekiah* did neither of them: Nor does any other Prince, who contains himſelf within his line, as *Hezekiah* did. And the Licenſing of your Miniſters to return to their publick ſtations, is no other, (as afterward ſhall be cleared) but moſt like unto *Hezekiahs* practice in ſeveral points above rehearſed. And conſequently no fault in your Miniſters acceptance thereof in ſo far as it is accepted by them.

Add to this *Jehoſhaphats* approved practice in 2 *Chron.* 17. 7, 8. where we find he *ſent* the *Le-*

vites

vites to *teach* the Lords word in divers *places* of the land; who *went* accordingly. Whence it is evident,

(1) That it is not repugnant to the Word of God, that in some cases, specially in a lapsed case of the Church, the Magistrate may dispose upon Ministers, as to place and parts of a Land, where they may exercise their Ministry, at least for a time; may send them here and there, the Churches need calling for it: And that this is no proper Ecclesiastical planting or transplanting of Ministers (as some invidiously term it), but only a Civil Authorization as to exercising their function in such a place for longer or shorter time, as need may be.

(2) It is evident also here, that in such a case, the Pastors *Ministerial Mission* or *Commission* to Teach and Preach, is not from the Magistrate, but from the Lord; nor do they innovate or renounce their Commission from the Lord, by receiving the Magistrates superadded mission or command and legal warrant; nor do they therefore cease to be Christs Ministers or Ambassadors in his name, or become Council-Curates, (as some opprobriously and injuriously alledg) because the King by his Council adds his civil Sanction to the Authority they have of Christ. Who can say, their *Levites* were *Jehoshaphats* Curates, and not the Lords Ministers, for undergoing the like appointment of his power? Does the Magistrates supervenient Authority diminish or enervate the antecedent intrinsick power and spiritual authority of their office, or alter its nature? Is Christs Com-

Commiſſion to his Ambaſſadors, and the Magiſtrates adding his Civil Warrant (kiſſing and ſerving the Son of God therein, as *Pſal.* 2. 11, 12.) deſtructive and ſubverſive, and not rather corroborative one of another; and may ſweetly conſpire together, as being, though *Diverſa*, yet not *Adverſa*; and contrary one to another? *Subordinata, & ſubſervientia, non pugnant.* Add to all this, that ſeveral of your General Aſſemblies, the ſupreme Court of Chriſt in your Church, when they were (as oft they were) Indicted and Convocate by the Kings Authority, and upon his Command and Proclamation did ſit; were they (pray you) therefore but Eraſtian Courts and Synagogues, deriving all their Authority from the King, and acting in his Name, like other Civil Judicatories of the Kingdom, *i. e.* the Seſſion or Parliament? were they in this caſe not at all Chriſts Court, nor acting in his name as his Ambaſſadors, and not the Kings? was this in them a renouncing of Chriſts Headſhip, and an acknowledging of another Lord and Maſter, and a taking of Commiſſion from the Civil Magiſtrate? *&c.* We hope none will be ſo abſurd as to affirm it, or to think that the Magiſtrates Auxiliary deed, and their making uſe of it, was derogatory either to Chriſts Kingly Office, or to the Aſſemblies intrinſick power, or altered their nature from being purely ſpiritual Courts of Chriſt. Even ſo, what more does the Prince, his *permitting* or *appointing* actual Miniſters to exerciſe their Office here or there, in this broken ſtate of the Church, conſtitute them his Curates or Delegates?

gates? or ſtate them guilty of Homologating an Eraſtian power, and eſtabliſhing a ſpiritual ſupremacy in the Magiſtrate? or infer them to be ſuch as may not ſay to people, *Over you hath the Holy Ghoſt made us overſeers*, but the King? Certainly if the ſuperaddition of the Magiſtrates Authority do not innovate nor prejudice the Aſſemblies Authority in the exerciſe of Government; neither doth it the Miniſters in the Exerciſe of their Function. The Magiſtrate herein but *ſerves* the Lord and his Chriſt, and his Spouſe the Church, and her Miniſtry, but acts not as in Chriſts ſtead as her *Head* and *Lord*.

Q. The Magiſtrate his interpoſing his Authority in this caſe, what place holds it then, ſay ye?

Anſw. It is not conſtitutive of their Office (as was in the caſe of theſe Prieſts whom *Jeroboam* did *make* and conſtitute of the loweſt of the people), but cumulative to it, (*Accumulando jura juribus*) in a ſubſervient and extrinſick way; and corroborative of its Exerciſe, and determineth them in the exerciſe thereof as to ſome circumſtances, namely the place, or places of the Land, where they are to exerciſe their work. Now this power aforeſaid being not improper to Kings under the Old Teſtament, why may they not under the New put forth the like, as your own Divines hold, and none but the *Papiſts* and *Anabaptiſts* deny? And if they may in ſome caſes *appoint*, much more *permit*, as your Indulgence is, as hereafter ſhall be made to appear.

To this Scriptural Doctrine agreeth: (1) That gene-

general Aſſertion, *That to the Prince it belongeth as Nurſe-father of the Church, to take care, and do what in him lyes, in ways and by means congruous to his capacity and ſphere, that indigent people be provided with a godly and well-qualified Miniſtry*; as learned Mr. *Gilleſpy* (that noble Antagoniſt of the Eraſtian Exorbitancies of the Civil power) hath it in his hundred and eleven Propoſitions, *Propoſ.* 41. And before him, famous Mr. *Welſh*, in his Epiſtle Dedicatory to King *James*, prefixed to his piece againſt Popery, ſpeaking of the forementioned practices of *Hezekiah* and *Jehoſhaphat*, ſaith to the King, *Follow theſe Examples, Sir; ſend Paſtors through all the borders of your Kingdom to teach your Subjects the Law of the Lord their God, &c.* We hope ye will not think or ſay that eminent man of God (who ſuffered ſo much for aſſerting the Churches rights, and withſtanding the incroachments of the time) doth here teach the King Eraſtian Principles or practices, or Papal and Spiritual Supremacy; and yet as much doth he teach, as your Indulgence amounts unto, in what of it is accepted by the Brethren.

(2) Ponder how particularly your Church concedeth to the Magiſtrate a power to put Miniſters to particular Charges, when the Church is not in her ordinary or well ſetled caſe: as in the *ſecond Book of Diſcipline*, Chap. 10. §. *laſt*, they ſay, *That Kings and Princes that be godly, may by their Authority, when the Kirk is corrupted, and all things out of order, place Miniſters, and reſtore the true ſervice of the Lord, after the example of ſome godly Kings of* Judah, *&c.* So bleſſed Mr. *Welſh*

in the formentioned Epiſtle to King *James*, approves of the King his being deſirous (as he had profeſſed in two Aſſemblies) *to plant every Pariſh within his Kingdom with a Paſtor.* Which expreſſions of *placing* and *planting*, uſed in the foreſaid Citations, albeit they mean not of Ordaining and making of Miniſters conſtitutively, but only a ſetling of Miniſters (already Ordained) in particular places; yet ſurely they import no leſs than the word [*Appoint*] in the firſt Indulgence, and more than the Grant of the ſecond, which only *permits* Miniſters to Preach in ſuch and ſuch vacant Congregations. Yea further, in the firſt *Book of Diſcipline*, pag. 37. it is expreſly allowed to the Magiſtrate in ſuch a caſe to *appoint* Miniſters to certain *Provinces* and Charges.

§. If any *except* here that this power is aſcribed only to *Godly* Magiſtrates, ſuch as *Hezekiah*, *&c.* was.

To this we ſay three things: (1) Is it not hard to ſeclude any Prince profeſſing the Goſpel, and being a member of the Viſible Church, from the claim at leaſt of Fœderal Holineſs, notwithſtanding he have his own perſonal faults? ſee *Job* 34. 18.

(2) Ye know it is a Popiſh principle to ſay, *Dominium fundatur in gratia*, that Soveraignty and power is grounded on Grace and Piety. Whence it is when Kings change their Religion, and turn Proteſtant (which they call Hereſie) the Pope declareth them fallen from their Regality, exauctorats and depoſeth them. Your Confeſſion of Faith teacheth otherwiſe, *Chap.* 23. §. 4. *That Infidelity*

fidelity or difference of Religion does not make void the Magistrates just and Legal Authority. Hence Mr. *Calderwood*, Mr. *Rutherford*, and others of your Writers teach, that neither doth Piety add, nor Impiety detract any Legal power, but only inable or disable to the right use of his power. In vain therefore use ye the distinction here betwixt Godly and Ungodly Magistrates, as if their Legal power were not the same.

(3) We find in Scripture, even Pagan Princes warrantably claiming and exercising such-like power about matters of Religion, as *Cyrus*, *Darius*, *Artaxerxes* and others. From all which considerations we see it plain, that the Regal Power is not augmented by the Princes Religiousness, nor diminished by his Irreligion; but both the Godly and ungodly Magistrate have the same power about Religion; though it be true, that without piety he will not have the Sanctified, nor readily any discreet and good use of it. And indeed, if Religion were a ground of Authority and power about the matters of God, then all Saints and Religious persons should have that power, and be as Kings and Magistrates to act *Hezekiahs* part; for, *a Quatenus ad omne valet consequentia.*

As for the Phrase used in the forecited place of the Book of Discipline, seeming to limit the power *circa sacra* to godly Magistrates; *We answer*, The word *Godly* is added there, not *Reduplicatively*, but *Specificatively*, that is, not as a Diacritical Limiting designation, (or restriction of the power to Piety) but as a plain qualification of the Persons who find mercy to use that power well, which

(of Right) is common, and equally due to Princes in the like case.

If, again any say, These Kings of *Judah* were *Prophets*, and that power about Religion (forementioned) appertained to them as *Prophets* only, and consequently not to any Kings now adays; nor can their example be for imitation. *We answer*, This is a great mistake; how will it ever be proved that *Hezekiah* and *Jehoshaphat* were Prophets, or clothed with any extraordinary power, incompetent to other Kings? What ground in Scripture is there for this? And how can ye believe it without a Scripture-Warrant? Moreover, we ask, were the Heathen Kings, forementioned, Prophets? And yet they intermedled in like manner about affairs of Religion.

If any further say, Howbeit such a power to interpose so far in and about Ecclesiastical Matters, to redress and settle things out of course, *&c.* be competent to other Magistrates *in a broken State of the Church*; yet who can allow it to him who *is*, or *hath been* the Troubler of the Church himself? To this the *Answer* is, (1.) What Reason can there be to debar such an one from interposing to redress what himself hath overturned, more than his Successor? (for ye grant one may justly interpose thus to Reform what his Predecessor marred:) What binds up a King from doing the same, as to what himself hath disordered? Who will say, but *Manasseh* might have done, in the case of the Church by himself corrupted, whatever *Jehoshaphat* or *Hezekiah* did, in her case, perverted by others?

Would

Would not Reaſon ſay, the Prince is the more obliged to Interpone his power, and extend it as far as others for her Relief, that himſelf was the Author of her Malady? And to open the door to Miniſters which himſelf did ſhut? And to build what he formerly did deſtroy? Can any Relevant Exception be aſſigned againſt this? If ye *ſay*, This tends to incourage the Magiſtrate to trouble and break the Church, and caſt matters in confuſion, that he may have the more latitude of power to Act in Church-matters. *Anſw.* Not at all; becauſe with no reaſon can it be ſaid, the allowing him power to do good and heal, does natively and juſtly incourage and warrant him to take power to hurt and do ill. We humbly ſuppoſe it rather implies a Challenge: Certain it is, no man may do evil that good may come of it, nor does the good that reſults upon occaſion of evil, juſtifie Bigones, nor encourage to more in the future. Conſider (2.) That it is not properly his fault of perturbing the Church, but her Neceſſity and his Office, which alloweth him to intermeddle ſo far; and therefore, as his fault obligeth him to Repentance, (ſpecially if it was done upon wicked deſign, to get Scouthroom to act extraordinarily in reſtoring her again) ſo it cannot juſtly be reckoned to deprive him of power to put things in order again, in as far as may be congruous to any other Princes, who had not injured the Church themſelves. But on the contrary, His doing her wrong, obligeth him the more to make amends: A Chyrurgeon, who cuts his Pupils Arm, to try an experiment of his Art and Balſom upon it,

it, has he not as good right to heal it again himſelf as any other? Yea, Is he not the more concerned to do the Cure? His fooliſh or wicked practice in being the Author of the Sore, does not diſoblige him from, but rather oblige him unto, the Cure.

Now lay what is ſaid together, and ſith thereby it is evident that the Magiſtrate may, in an extraordinary caſe, put forth himſelf lawfully (without uſurping Eccleſiaſtical Power, properly ſo called, or encroaching upon the Churches Rights) to allocate Miniſters to certain places; may he not much more Remove the *Legal Bars* (in *whole* or in *part*) which debarred your Miniſters from the free exerciſe of their Office, and permit them acceſs to return to their Charges, or to officiate in ſome other vacancies? which is your very caſe; wherein your Miniſters did not take his Licenſe, as ſufficient to ſtate them in a Paſtoral Relation to theſe Congregations; but beſide, they had the peoples call to determine and engage them to exerciſe their Miniſtry there for the time; ſo all they owe unto, and hold of the Magiſtrate, is, that *Eatenus removet prohibens*; *t.* 1. He ſo far takes off the Legal Reſtraint, under the force whereof they did lye, and by permiſſion and allowance of his Authority, they are freed of danger of the Law, in the publick exerciſe of their Office there; a thing which He was (in duty) obliged to *do*, and they to *take hold of*, and to count it a mercy and priviledg to have it. But *ſay* ye, Had he Reſcinded, Revoked, and Annulled the Act at *Glaſgow*, that outed them, it had been clearer to have been ſo:

But

But when he lets that ſtand, and only gives a new permiſſion or Mandate to Preach, that looks like more. *Anſ.* Not only the Act of Council at *Glaſgow*, by which they were outed of their Charges, but all other Acts and Laws by which they were reſtrained from the exerciſe of their Miniſtry any where within *Scotland*, unleſs they conformed, are certainly ſufficiently taken off the Fyle, as to them. For, the King having the Executive Power of the Law, albeit he did not fully *Repeal* and Reſcind thoſe Acts and Laws, yet by his Indulgence *ſuſpendeth* them, as to the Indulged: And albeit this be not done *in Terminis*, yet Directly, Formally, and Expreſly, yet *Materially* and *Virtually*, in allowing them to exerciſe their Office in ſuch and ſuch places, any Laws to the contrary notwithſtanding. For, when the Legiſlative, or Supreme Adminiſtrator, permits or commands a thing contrary to the ſtanding Laws, in all Law it is underſtood to exempt and priviledge theſe Perſons from the ſaid Laws, and to *indulge* them a Liberty and immunity from theſe Statutes. Now, this is the preſent Indulgence; the Native Effect and Operation whereof is, to *diſpenſe* with the Legal Inhibition theſe Miniſters were under, but not at all to inveſt them with new ſpiritual power to officiate, as ſome invidiouſly alledge. And by this diſpenſation, the Indulged to their own Charges are really and in effect reſtored *in integrum*, and put *in ſtatu quò prius*, as to any Liberty the Laws debarred them from, in reſpect of their Miniſtry there; and theſe indulged to other parts, are ſo far reſtored, as to be indemnified and licenſed to Preach there, being

being before interdicted to Preach any where.

And by virtue of this Indulgence, neither the one nor the other ſort of theſe Miniſters do Officiate upon a new *Miniſterial Title* (as is unjuſtly alledged) the Indulgence conferring or pretending to confer no ſuch thing; only it gives them a new Legal Immunity to exerciſe their old Miniſtry in ſuch and ſuch places. Any that wreſt the Interpretation of this Indulged Liberty to any other Senſe, ſeems to us, and all unprejudiced men, to put a ſiniſter and malicious gloſs upon it.

But in the third place, perhaps ye will ſay, it is not the ſimple taking a Licenſe from the Magiſtrate, which offends you; but it is the particular Nature and Tenour of this Indulgence, as under ſuch and ſuch ſinful Circumſtances, which ſeems to illegitimate it.

Anſ. What are theſe?

O, ſay ye, *Firſt*, In General, Are not theſe Acts of Council, wherein the Indulgence conſiſts and is comprehended, very ugly in ſeveral points, and various reſpects? Is not their Deed then, in accepting ſuch an ill circumſtantiated Liberty, moſt diſallowable?

For *Anſwer* to this, Let us 1. Conſider, What theſe Acts are? (Next) How far the Indulged Miniſters has accepted, or not accepted, the ſame. And (3.) What your Exceptions are, againſt what they have done.

As for the Acts of Council relating to this Liberty, they are namely two. The one Ordereth *the Miniſters therein named, to Repair to ſuch and ſuch Pariſhes as are therein expreſſed, and there to*

remain

remain confined, permitting them to Preach in the ſaid Pariſhes, and exerciſe their Miniſtry there. This is properly the Act of Indulgence.

The other Act, which followed the former, appointeth the Indulged to obſerve ſeveral things, which they call *Rules, viz.* 1. *Not to Baptize any Children, except of the Pariſhes to which they are confined, or of their Neighbour-Pariſhes, if vacant.* 2. *To Celebrate their Communions all in one day.* 3. *That they Preach only in the Kirk, and not in the Kirk-Yard, nor in other places of the Pariſh, under an heavy pain.* 4. *That they depart not forth of their Pariſhes without leave.* 5. *That in their Exerciſe of Diſcipline, the Caſes formally referrable to Presbyteries, be by them referred to the Conformiſts-Meetings, which now are in place of Presbyteries.* 6. *To pay the Burſars and Clarks their Fees, as formerly wont to be.* This Act is not of *Indulgence*, but rather of *Reſtrictions.*

Now *ſay* ye, How could the Magiſtrate lawfully make, or Miniſters accept, ſuch an Indulgence, namely, ſo clogged?

To *Anſwer* this, It is neceſſary (in the *next* place) to conſider what theſe Miniſters have done, and what is the true ſtate of the Controverſie between you and them. To which we ſay in the general, that it is no ſmall injury done to them, to charge them with all and every thing comprehended in theſe Acts, as if they had ſwallowed all down in groſs, without exception of any. And conſequently, it is a great miſtake to think, whatever may be juſtly objected againſt ſundry of thoſe things ſo enacted, does militate againſt them and

their

their deed, seeing they disclaim and never owned most of these things more than those do who reject all. And is it not hard from their acceptance of a part, *viz.* the naked permitted liberty, to infer and cast upon them an Homologation of the whole contents of these acts?

Here then it would be remembred what the true state of the Question is: Which is not, (1) Whether these acts forementioned be in all things approvable and rightly done? But what in all or any of these acts might be and is lawfully done? Particularly, Whether or not the Magistrate might and did *jure* order these Ministers, and repair unto, and grant them a permission to Preach and exercise the other parts of their Ministry in such and such places as are mentioned in the Act? In a *complex* Act there may be many things largely censurable, and very sinful, upon the Magistrates part; yet may there be other things not unwarrantable. And in that case the one are not to be condemned out of distaste at the other. And certainly, whatever incompetency or iniquity may be alledged to be in other points of these Acts, it will be hard to find any in the particular forementioned, *viz.* the Indulged liberty.

(2) It is not so much to be Queried, what is *Lawfully*, as what is *Legally* done in this by the Magistrate; for a thing (for example, the confinement of a Godly Minister for no fault) may be very unlawfully and unjustly done, and a real sin upon the Magistrates part, like other acts of Injustice; yet may it be legally done, that is

to

to say, not Heterogeneous and incompetent to his Office, not beyond the bounds of his power; and therefore cannot therein be counted an *Usurper* (or Erastian), though perhaps not free of *Iniquity*. This consideration well observed, may help to clear a frequent mistake in many simple people who count every act of injustice real or supposed in the Ruler about matters of Religion, an act of Erastianism or Papal Supremacy.

(3) Neither is the Question so much, What has the Magistrate done in all this, as, What has the *Ministers accepted*, or *submitted unto*? For, perhaps there are many more things enacted by him, than imbraced by them. Now what are the Ministers concerned farther, than as to what they have accepted, or yielded submission unto? Let each bear their own burden, and not every thing, wherein it is supposed the Magistrate hath done amiss, be charged upon the Ministers.——

(4) It is not the Question either, Whether or not it be lawful for Ministers to have closed with the *whole complex* of both these Acts? This ye know they never did; nor do they allow of all contained in these Acts more than you do. But the Question is, Whether might they lawfully accept of, or submit unto *any* thing contained therein, rejecting the rest as evil, or inconvenient; Particularly, whether they might upon the above-mentioned order, repair to such and such Parishes, and there Preach the Gospel, and exercise the other parts of their Ministry, being permitted by the Magistrate, and also called thereunto by the people, and this for such time only (in case it be

not

not their former charge) until they ſhould have regreſs to their former Pariſhes? This ye know is all they did embrace. And in a complex buſineſs, why might not the good be taken hold of, and the evil abſtracted from, waved, and laid by? as is directed in the like caſes, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 21. *Prove all things*, ſays the Apoſtle, *and hold faſt that which is good.* And commended in *Iſa.* 7. 15. *Heb.* 5. *ult.* and recommended in *Phil.* 1. 9, 10. And whatever the Magiſtrate did *overſtretch* in, what is it to the Miniſters if they did not *cloſe* with theſe exceſſes, as they did not? If ye *ſay*, the circumſtances, or concomitants or parts of an action cannot be morally abſtracted from, or ſeparated the one from the other, ſeeing all concurs to make up the morality of the action; Therefore no circumſtances or parts of the Magiſtrates deed can be by the indulged ſeparate, more than by himſelf.

Anſ. Howbeit the circumſtances of the action cannot be juſtly waved by the *Agent*, as relating properly to him; yet no doubt but the *Patient* well may; and falſe it is to ſay, all the circumſtances upon the Agents part, does alſo terminate upon the Patient, and reflect upon the one as well as upon the other; as both Philoſophy and Divinity teacheth. It is not therefore to be doubted but a complex frame of Indulgence, clothed with vicious circumſtances, and ſtuffed with ill ingredients upon the granters part, might very well be divided by the accepters, and the good ſeparated from the bad, very warrantably; and this to be counted no more Logical abſtraction,

but

but wise and Christian discretion and discrimination; and consequently they ought not to be charged in this case, with accepting the Indulgence as circumstantiat in the Magistrate. But more of this after. And so they are not accessary to the guilt may be complicated in it, as it comes from the Magistrate.

From all which ye see, It is no small perversion of the state of the Question, as it is moulded by some in their Papers, making it to be this; *Whether the Magistrate, by virtue of his Office, may, of himself, and immediately without the Church, and the previous Election of the People, assign and send Ministers to particular Churches, to take the Fixed and Pastoral Oversight of them? And prescribe Rules and Directions to them, for the exercise of their Ministry, and confine them to the said Congregations?* And then Impugning this multiplex Question, renders their exceptions against it, as Reasons why they could not embrace the Indulgence, as their Brethren have done: As if Exceptions at any part of the Magistrates Deed, did justifie their refusing of the whole, and reflected guilt upon those who did not wholly reject it as they did; or as if their Brethren embraced all and whole of it, not separating the good from the evil. What unfair dealing is this? And among the many iniquities observable in this framing of the Question (whereof severals shall be spoken to afterwards, namely, concerning the Confinement, and Act of Regulation) these two at present would be noticed. I. That more is charged upon the Magistrate, than really he hath

done, namely, 1. It is supponed, that by the Indulgence he gives the Ministers a *spiritual potestative mission* (as they call it) for Preaching to such Congregations, and taking Pastoral Charge thereof: Hence they frame their Arguments to militate against the Indulgence, as if therein the Magistrate took upon him the Spiritual Power of the Church in *Ordination* and *Admission*. Whereas all his Mission or Assignment is purely Civil and Local (as appeareth by the Tenor of the Act) ordering them to repair to such Parishes, and be confined therein; only (for mitigation of their Confinement) he permits and allows them also liberty to Preach there, yet leaving it to peoples liberty to call them, and to their own liberty to embrace that call, to exercise their Ministry there, or not, as they pleased; (for their Preaching is not *enjoyned*, but *permitted*.) Whence it is plain, there was no *Moral* or *Spiritual Mission*, nor *Ecclesiastical Admission* and *Setting* of these Ministers over these Congregations, like that in *Tit.* 1. 5. *Acts* 14. 23. (unless ye call confinement to the place, with a civil permission to Preach there, a spiritual and potestative Mission which were absurd.) And therefore all the Arguments mustered up (upon this account) against the Indulged Liberty *cum larvis luctantur*, fights with their own Fancy only, and makes nothing against the true question. Yea further, Suppose there had been some sort of *Political* Mission, or Appointment and Command, such as *Jehoshaphat* gave to the Levites, and *Hezekiah* to the Priests, as aforesaid; yet that differs *toto genere* from an *Ecclesiastical* Mission, such as the Church gave *Barnabas*

nabas and *Paul*, *Act.* 13. 2, 3.

The Magiſtrates political Appointment in this caſe, being not a *Spiritual Authorization* in the Name of Chriſt, but merely a *Legal Warrant*; not conferring intrinſick power and right to Preach, or be Paſtors to theſe people, but only warranting them (in point of Law) to exerciſe their Miniſtry to and among them. 2. It is ſupponed here, that the Miniſters are ſent to take the *Fixed* and *Paſtoral Charge* of theſe Congregations; whereas there is no ſuch thing in the Act; but ſimply a *confining*, with a *Licenſe* to Preach, without defining in what capacity, whether as a *ſtated* Paſtor of that people, or in *occaſional way* only, as they and the people ſhould agree: So that as their Aſſignment is but local, their Liberty but legal and permiſſive, their capacity alſo of Preaching there is left undetermined by the Magiſtrate. Thus ye ſee, more is alledged (in this ſort of ſtating the queſtion) to be done by the Magiſtrate, than indeed He hath done. How unequal is this, that men ſhould put their Commentary and Senſe of the Matter, for the Text! And ſtate the Queſtion according to their miſtaken Notion, and not according to Truth?

The Second Enquiry in this ſtating of the Queſtion, and in determining and impugning thereof as ſo ſtated, is, That it is ſuppoſed the Contents of the Councils Acts were propoſed to be accepted all and whole together, or elſe none, and nothing at all: And that theſe who have embraced the Indulged Liberty, have joyned with all. Whereas, ſo notorious it is, that neither the one nor the other is true, that we need not inſiſt to demonſtrate the

ſame. And if any be ſo bold, as to affirm the contrary, it is incumbent to them to prove it, before their aſſerting can merit any credit with Rational Men. In ſum then, the genuine and plain ſtate of the queſtion is, *Whether or no, when the Law had outed you all of your Charges, and reſtrained you moſt ſeverely from all publick, free, and peaceable Exerciſe of your Miniſtry, in any part of the Kirk and Kingdom of* Scotland; *whether or not (I ſay) did the Magiſtrate lawfully diſpenſe with, and take off that Reſtraint, as to ſome Perſons and Places? And the Miniſters thereby Licenſed, did they lawfully make uſe of that liberty, being withal moſt ſeriouſly called thereunto by the People?* Now, what is exceptable againſt this? This is the true ſtate of the Controverſie betwixt you and your Brethren; what is your quarrel at it?

There are nine particular Objections (the moſt material and moſt uſual, ſo far as we can learn) which here we ſhall conſider and anſwer, finding them not Relevant to prove the concluſion they drive at.

1. Some ſay, This Indulgence it is mere Eraſtianiſm, and an Homologation of the Supremacy.

2. They object the Rules and Inſtructions forementioned.

3. Some alledg this Preaching with the Magiſtrates permiſſion and allowance, to be a Renouncing of their former Commiſſion from Jeſus Chriſt, and a taking of a new one from the Magiſtrate, and an holding of their Miniſtry of him with ſubjection unto him, and dependance upon him, like other Civil Judges of the Land.

4. Divers

4. Divers offend at the Magiſtrates intent and deſign in this Indulgence.

5. Others ſtumble at the narrowneſs of the Liberty, as to Perſons and Places; and alſo as to the extent of the Exerciſe of Government permitted to theſe Miniſters.

6. The manner of their Entry is quarrelled by ſome, as not being called by the people, nor admitted by Order of Presbytery, as wont to be.

7. Other ſome cry out for want of a Teſtimony againſt the Magiſtrates Incroachments, and other ſad grievances, in theſe and other of his Acts.

8. Some exagitates them for their confinement, yea for their fixing at all, though it be in their former Charge.

9. Others ſtumble at this, that ſo many other zealous and godly Miniſters and people are againſt it, and all the Godly divided about it.

To all theſe we ſhall ſay ſomewhat ſhortly, to clear the miſtakes therein.

As to the Firſt, O ſays ſome, *Is not this Indulgence a Maſter-piece of the States Eraſtianiſm, and of the Prince his ſinful Supremacy now aſſerted by Law? And conſequently the accepting thereof, an homologating and ſupporting of both?*

Upon this Head, how admirably do ſome Triumph, inſult, yea and anathematize the Indulgence, and all that has accepted thereof, or hears the Indulged Men! What fierce Outcryes are made, eſpecially by ſome Novices and Vulgars, harping continually (almoſt) upon this String, as their moſt melodious Muſick to pleaſe themſelves

with, and their greateſt Argument to decry theſe Licenſed Brethren by; canting theſe jingling Vocables of *Supremacy*, *Homologat*, *Eraſtian*, *ad Ravim uſque:* And yet knows not perhaps what they ſay, nor whereof they affirm; nor are able at all to rid marches, and diſtinctly tell what power about Eccleſiaſtick matters does of right belong to the Magiſtrate, and what not; nor what is Eraſtianiſm, or ſinful Supremacy, or Homologating of either. *Experti loquimur.*

But let all that quarrel upon this ſcore, ſeriouſly ponder theſe few things, which we preſume to lay before them, to take off their offence as to this: (1) Be ye well aſſured, your indulged Brethren and ye agree well enough in *Theſi* (in the general), That no Eraſtianiſm, nor unlawful Supremacy (properly and truly ſo called) is to be complied with? They abhor both as much as you do. All the difference is about the *Hypotheſis* (or particular application); that they cannot call every thing ſo, which you do call ſo; particularly, that in this indulged liberty, as accepted by them, they can ſee neither of theſe. If you ſee further than they, bring forth your ſtrong reaſons, plead with them in love, and labour to convince them. Mean time be ſober till ye prove your Aſſertions demonſtratively, and not by confident averring, nor by weak and unconcluding Reaſons. Certainly *Fortia, non Phalerata*, ſoft words and hard arguments were your beſt for convincing and reclaiming your honeſt Brethren, in caſe they err here.

(2) As for the charge of Eraſtianiſm, let it be con-

considered what is Erastianism, but when the Magistrate usurps in whole or in part the internal, proper, formal spiritual power of Church-Government (called in Scripture, *The power of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*)? and so wresting these Keys out of the Kirks hand, and ingrossing them to himself, accordingly exerciseth them, or delegates them to others. Now who can warrantably say, this indulged liberty is of that nature? being meerly a Civil or Legal permission to exercise their Ministry, notwithstanding the Laws to the contrary. Whatever may be deemed of the Act of Instructions so called, (wherein they are not much concerned, as after may be cleared), surely this Act of Licensing them to Preach in such and such places, is no proper, formal, intrinsick Act of the power of the *Keys* (no more than the *Roman* Governours permitting of *Paul* to Preach, *Act.* 21. 39, 40. & 26. 1.) But rather an Act of the Regal *Scepter*; and is only objectively Ecclesiastical: And consequently no Erastianism, nor without the verge of the Prince his just power, as hath been formerly shewed. Any that are contrary minded, we humbly judg their Brethren will think themselves much obliged to them, if they will convince them of their mistake in this, if there be any. Mean time it is hoped these Opponents will not obtrude big words, or bold Assertions, or crafty insinuations, instead of solid probations. Let School Doctors digladiat nimbly among themselves, contending for the palm of Victory, rather than for Verity; and let them dictate to their Disci-

ples, as if their αὐτος ἐφὰ, their bare authority were enough to reſt upon. It is hoped Divines and Chriſtians will be far from ſuch humours and practices; and will know, that every man muſt live by his own faith, and not implicitely upon anothors word. Convince your Brethren then of what Eraſtianiſm, or overſtretch of the Magiſtrate his power is in this particular, as accepted by them, if ye find any in it; and hear what they have to ſay for themſelves, before ye condemn them, and divide from them, as is taught you, *Joh.* 8. 46. & 7. 51. *Act.* 25. 16. Yea, ſuppoſe the Magiſtrate had ſtretched a little beyond his ordinary line, in the permiſſion granted (which yet we ſee not), nevertheleſs may not the extraordinary caſe of the Church do much to excuſe, yea purge it of crime? in which caſe the moſt ſtrict Presbyterians and Anti-Eraſtian Divines are loth to charge him with the odious imputation of Eraſtianiſm. Read your worthy Mr. *Gilleſpy*, *Aarons Rod*, pag. 182. *In extraordinary caſes* (ſays he) *when Church-Government doth degenerate into Tyranny* (*as under Popery it is for the moſt part*) *then*——*the Chriſtian Magiſtrate may and ought to do divers things in and for Religion, and interpoſe his Authority divers ways, ſo as doth not belong unto his*——*Adminiſtration, ordinarily in a Reformed and well conſtituted Church: Becauſe extraordinary Diſeaſes muſt have extraordinary Remedies.* To this ſame purpoſe ſpeaks bleſſed Mr. *Rutherford* in his *Due Right of Presbytery*, *pag.* 416. Here more is conceded by your ſtrictſt Writers, than the accepted liberty amounts unto.

(3) As

(3) As for the Supremacy, as it is now eſtabliſhed by Law, *Parliament* 2*d*, *Caroli* 2. *Seſſ.* 1. *Act.* 1. We ſhall not at preſent ſcan the nature of it, whether it be only (as ſome of your ſelves judg) a meer *Civil* Supremacy *about* Eccleſiaſtical perſons and things, but exalted to a *dangerous height*, devolving all the Legal power (about matters of Religion) into the Kings hand, making him abſolute, and intirely ſupreme, *Quo ad Statum Politicum*, that is, in point of Civil Prerogative, Arbitrary; ſo as he may do in Church-matters (in point of Law or Civil capacity) as he thinks fit, without advice or conſent of the Eſtates of Parliament? or whether it be (as moſt others judg) a *Cæſarec-Papatus* (as they ſpeak) or a *Papal*, *Spiritual Supremacy*, [that is] a power to diſpoſe abſolutely in a Soveraign, Arbitrary, Deſpotical way, (as well *in genere Ethico*, as *in genere Politico*), upon the matters mentioned in that Act; Particularly, to ſettle what *kind* or *Form* of *Government* in the Church he pleaſeth, and in whoſe *hands* he pleaſeth; as if all the ſpiritual power of Church-Government were in him as *Head* and *Fountain*, and *Modellable* by him at pleaſure; even as the Civil perhaps at firſt was? and conſequently it be an high incroachment upon Chriſts Crown, to whom alone, as the only King, Head, and Monarch of his Church, ſuch a tranſcendent power and priviledg does belong? We ſay, we judg it not neceſſary to examine that matter now. But this we may offer to be conſidered, That whatever Overſtretch of the Soveraigns power be made in that Act of Supremacy,

macy, as (upon the one hand) none of the Indulged alloweth thereof, more than any others; but lament, as much as any, the extravagancies of this or any other Acts of Parliament, tending to the prejudice of our Lord Jesus Christ his Rights, or of the intrinsick Rights and Liberties of his Church; so (upon the other hand) who can, with any reason affirm, that this Indulged Liberty (in so far as it is accepted by your Brethren) hath any affinity with such a Papal Supremacy, or is a part of the unclean thing that might not be touched? Any that aver it to be so, we humbly beg their Reasons: for, hitherto we have seen few, but some quirks and iniquous lame similitudes and comparisons, which are not Argumentative, as all Scholars know, however taking they be with the vulgar; and you know too, that, *Affirmanti incumbit probatio*, the burden of probation is incumbent to the pursuer. Nevertheless (for exculpation) we shall lay before you five reasons, which we humbly judg may weigh much with any sober and unprejudicate persons to evidence the contrary.

(1) Consider the nature of this Toleration or Indulgence: It is (as hath been shewed already) meerly an Act of supreme *Civil* power *Circa Sacra*, and therefore differs *toto genere* (as far as Heaven from Earth), from *Spiritual* Supremacy, and is nothing of kindred to it; though somewhat of the name.

(2) A *Politico-Papatus*, or Papal spiritual Supremacy, seated in *Cæsar*, consists (as Writers define it) in a power to alter and dispose arbitrarily upon

upon Christs Institutions, and to pervert the frame of Religion at pleasure, and to set up Humane Institutions in their room, as *Jeroboam* did. But this Indulged Liberty is not of that nature, but rather an act of his power as Nurse-Father to the Church, (*Isa.* 49. 23.) being for restoring and countenancing Christs *own* Ministers and Ordinances, and not of Humane inventions, for promoving, not subverting of Religion; for the good, not the hurt of the Church; an Auxiliary, not a privative exercise of his power. Therefore being an Act of the Magistrates kissing the Son of God, (*Psal.* 2. 12.) and ministring to the Church in her distress, (as *Isa.* 60. 10.) surely it can be no act of that Papal Supremacy, derogatory to Christs Prerogative. Who can (with the least grain of reason) say, that the restoring (in any part) of Christs Ministers and Ordinances, is a taking of Christs Crown off his head, (as some of you call the Indulgence) and not rather an helping to put it on?

(3) Manifest it is, that the Supremacy asserted in that Act of Parliament, relates directly only to the matter of Church-Government, the disposal thereof, and of persons to be imployed therein, and matters to be treated therein. And so whatever disposal of the Key of Discipline it put into the Prince his hand, yet no ways medleth with the Key of Doctrine, and power of *Order*, i. e. the investing of men with the power of Preaching, and Ministring the Sacraments; for the Act expresly limits the Supremacy to the ordering and disposal of the external Government

of

of the Church. But ſo it is, that this Indulged Liberty (as the Copies of the Act which we have happened to ſee, bears) is only, a *permiſſion to Preach* (including virtually a permiſſion to adminiſter the Sacraments alſo), but no Licenſe is mentioned therein to exerciſe Church-Government (albeit they venture upon ſome parts of Government alſo, competent to a Congregation, being connived at therein); whence it followed, the Indulgence granted them can be no efflux of that Supremacy, being not *ad Idem.* Or if the Act of Indulgence be of this tenor (as is ſaid ſome other Copies bear) *permitting them to preach and exerciſe other parts of their Miniſtry*; thence it is evident that the Act of Indulgence *preſuppoſes* their power and right to Preach, &c. and that they have a Miniſtry, and intrinſick right to exerciſe all its parts, *antecedently* to that Indulged Liberty; but no way *confers* a new Copy-hold of their Miniſtry: Only it ſays, the exerciſe thereof was under a Civil Inhibition, or Legal Reſtraint, which this Indulgence takes off. But ſo it is, that the Supremacy, as it is aſſerted, is a power of conferring power of the matters therein expreſſed (as ye your ſelves grant) as if the Prince were head and fountain thereof. Sith therefore by the Indulgence the power of Preaching and exerciſing the other parts of the Miniſtry is not delegate, nor derived unto them, but only the free and peaceable exerciſe thereof permitted, and reſtraints removed, plain it is that the Indulgence is no Act of that Supremacy. And that even the power of Kirk-Seſſions, or Conſiſtorial

r'al parts of Government exercised by them, differs specifically, and in kind, from what the Supremacy can pretend to give.

4. Power of Indulging is a thing which the Magistrate uncontroverted'y had, and did exercise anteriorly to the foresaid Assertion of Supremacy; for the first Indulgence was before it, and your selves grant that that Act Assertory of the Supremacy is not declarative only, (though it run in that Style, as the *Stylus Curiæ*) but Collative and Constitutive, conferring upon him more than ever he had before, else why did not ye and your Church Resent it before that Assertion of it? Whence it follows, that the Indulging Power is not a proper part of that new Supremacy, being existent before it had a Being; nor the Act of Indulgence, a Native Product of that Supremacy, but the Efflux of a power prior unto it.

5. The Act of Indulgence does not, in any the least Syllable or Jot of its Tenor, Refer unto, or Bottom it self upon, the asserted Supremacy; but runs in common Form and Style of other Civil Acts of the Council.

Whereas it is observable, that the Act of Restitution of the Bishops, and the Act anent Constitution of their National Synod, are expresly Founded upon the Kings Supremacy, as the Narratives thereof bear. Whence it is manifest, that even the Magistrate himself did not grant the Indulgence as an Act of that spiritual Supremacy, that new Jewel of his Crown, but merely as an Act of his ordinary Supreme Civil Power. Why then will ye Strain, Force, and Father it upon

that

that his Tranſcendent Supremacy, when himſelf does not ſo?

Upon all which Reaſons, ye ſee that the Indulgence, in ſo far as accepted by the Brethren, hath no Conſanguinity nor Affinity with that Supremacy as now aſſerted, and as expounded by you of a ſpiritual Supremacy.

From all theſe Conſiderations alſo it is plain, that the Argument uſed of late by ſome of you, to prove the Affinity of the Indulgence with the Supremacy, is but a very Sophiſm, *viz. To Enact, Settle, and make Conſtitutions, concerning Matters, Meetings, and Perſons Eccleſiaſtical, according to Royal Pleaſure*, is the very ſubſtanee and definition of the Supremacy, expreſſed in the Act Aſſertory of it: But the Indulgence is to *Enact, &c.* therefore it is the very ſubſtance and definition of the Supremacy. How do ſome Triumph in this, as a Demonſtration, and Achillean Argument; But, Beloved in the Lord, take with us a ſecond look of it, and weigh it in the Ballance of Right Reaſon, and ſee the weakneſs and fallacy of it in theſe few particulars.

1. The *Major* Propoſition is an unfaithful account of the Supremacy, as defined by the Act of Parliament; for the Act expreſly reſtricts it to Matters, Meetings, and Perſons of Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction and Government, as is before obſerved. And yet the Argument ampliates and extends it indefinitely unto all Matters, Meetings, and Perſons Eccleſiaſtical, of what kind ſoever, even of Worſhip as well as Government. And indeed it could not otherwiſe ſuit with the Subſumption, which

which comprehends these. Now, In this general Comprehension, it is a very great mistake; and if ye Limit it to matters of Government, (as it should be) then it varies the Supposition, and does not quadrate with the Subsumption; and would be *ex majori particulari in prima figura*, which is bad Logick.

2. As for the *Minor* Proposition, wherein ye apply your foresaid definition of Supremacy to the Indulgence, observe these mistakes in it.

1. That it meaneth of the whole Complex and full Latitude of the Indulgence, as comprehending all the parts and pendicles of it, the Act of Restrictive Rules and all; for so the Reverend Author in his Paper (called Mr. *B.* Testimony) labours to prove his Charge, by adducing these Rules and Canons, *&c.* as witnesses of it.

Whereas ye know (as was aboveſaid) that is not the State of the Question betwixt you and your Brethren; distinguish betwixt the Indulgence as *Enacted*, and as *Accepted:* And know, that whatever the Indulgence, as Enacted by the Magistrate in its full Latitude, may be charged with, or judged to comprehend, yea or not; sure ye'll find that part of it, which is accepted by your Brethren, not to be as is by you alledged, being only a permission or allowance of Liberty to Preach and Exercise the other parts of their Ministry, wherein no Vestige of the Supremacy (as expounded of a Papal, Arbitrary, Architectonick, Spiritual Supremacy) is to be found, as hath been already cleared. And for further clearing of which, consider,

2. That

2. That in this grant of Liberty, the Magistrate acteth not merely according to pleasure (except it be *in genere politico*, that is, as to his own deed, doing it without constraint, controul, or countableness to any person) but rather against his mind *in genere Ethico*, permitting that which he does not approve, as *Moses* did the Bill of Divorce: So that herein he acts not as a *Cæsareo-Papa*, or Head of the Church, and Fountain of Church-Offices, Enacting what he will in disposal of Church-matters, as modellable by his pleasure; but only and simply, as a Supreme Civil Magistrate, he suspends and dispenses with the Laws which curbed and hedged in your Brethren, and permits them now to enjoy a portion of their wonted Liberty, for Reasons of State expressed in his Act; so that while the major Proposition of the Argument tells us, that, *to Enact, Settle, and make such Constitutions about Matters, &c. Ecclesiastick, according to Royal Pleasure*; that is, to make any Acts anent them he will, as modellable, in their kind, at his Arbitriment, *is the Definition of the Supremacy*, (for in this Sense only it is truly so defined, as *Apollonius* and others tell.) And then subsumes, *that this Act of Indulgence*, even as accepted by the Brethren, *is of that Nature*; it is apparently a very great mistake; which might give us occasion to Remark what multiplyed Sophistry is in this Argument, *a compositione & divisione, ab ἁπλῶς ad κατά τι, ab Homonymia, &c.* But these we pass, as also to criticise upon that strange conclusion here inferred, That the Indulgence is the very substance and *definition* of the Supremacy;

and

and consequently the *All* of it, and convertible with it, as if the Supremacy and this Indulgence were reciprocal Terms, and whatsoever the Supremacy can pretend to, to that same is this Indulgence applicable, according to the Rule, *cui competit definitum, ei competit definitio; & vice versa.* But such Logical Remarks we forbear; only we are sorry to find such paralogizing among you in a matter so grave and serious: But more sorry that such a caption should deceive and insnare the simple. Had this Syllogism been applyed to the Act of Ejecting you, and that of demolishing the Church-Government, and erecting Prelacy in its stead, we should have thought it more pertinent and considerable. These being Acts of his Privative and Despotical power, and savouring of a more Dominative Supremacy: But while ye apply it to this Indulged Liberty, which is but a Cumulative and Auxiliary Act of his power, as Nurse-Father, and call this the very Essence, Exercise, and Application of the Supremacy (meaning Spiritual and Architectonick) who may not with half an eye see it a visible mistake? And pray you if the King should write down to the Council, and thereupon a Proclamation be made, for permitting, yea appointing and commanding that no Government be exercised in your Church, but the Presbyterian, and that forthwith it be set up and exercised, and all outed Ministers be allowed access to the free exercise of their Ministry any where; would you say, This were the Enacting, Settling, and Emitting Constitutions about Matters, Meetings, and Persons Ecclesiastick, ac-

cording to Royal pleaſure, and the very ſubſtance and definition of the Supremacy, and ſo caſt at it, as a thing vile, not to be touched? If not, (as no ſober, rational, man, will think ye ſhould) why judge ye otherwiſe of this partial Liberty? Both the one and the other being of one and the ſame grain, piece, and kind, though differing in meaſure. Upon all that is ſaid then, ye ſee it ſtill plain, that this indulged Liberty, in ſo far as it is accepted, hath nothing to do with this aſſerted Supremacy.

But *ſay* ye, Many are of the opinion that this power of ſo Indulging, though pre-exiſtent before, yet now is included in the Aſſertion of the Supremacy.

Anſwer. Though this be not evident, but much appears to the contrary by what is ſaid; yet, ſuppoſe it were ſo, that the clean and unclean power of civil and ſpiritual Supremacy, were compacted together in the ſame aſſertive Law, and declared Inherent to the ſame Crown, what then? Being in it ſelf lawful, does its Neighbourhood *(in eodem ſubjecto)* with what is counted unlawful, defile it? Does the Acceſſion or Conjunction of an Incompetent power, nullifie or corrupt the whole Syſteme of the Regal Authority? And conſequently, even that juſt power which did without controverſie belong to the Crown before that unjuſt Superaddition? And that, to ſuch a Degree, as neither he may exerce, nor ye make uſe (without ſin) of the Effluxes of the juſt power, till firſt he diſclaim, and lay by the Addition of what is undue? How Irrational were this? For, as Lawyers tell, *Accedente injuſtitiâ, non decedit, nec corrumpitur*

pitur juſta poteſtas. For example, An Husband, Father, or Maſter, uſurping the power of a Magiſtrate or Miniſter, does he therefore loſe and fall from his Marital, Paternal, or Maſterly Authority? Or is it a ſin in the Wife, Son, or Servant, to ſubmit unto, or make uſe of, the exerciſe of the one, while he doth not diſclaim the other? Sic-like *Uzzah*'s going beyond his Line, intrenching upon the Prieſtly Office, did it evacuate or vitiate his Levitical Power, ſo as (had he lived) no man might lawfully have made uſe of his Levitical Service? Or did *Saul* and *Uzzah* their Invading the Prieſts Office, yea or *Jeroboam*'s uſurping that ſinful Supremacy in the matters of God, render all their Regal Power *circa ſacra*, null or unclean, ſo as no uſe might be made of it, no not to the beſt ends? What a ſtrange Principle were this? And conſequently it cannot be admitted (which ſome, but few of you, have bigotly alledged) that it is not lawful either to ſeek or take any Indulgence or Benefit of the Magiſtrates power about the matters of Religion, until he Renounce what he has by Law or Practice aſſumed of Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy. Moreover, were this Principle admitted, how deſperate would it render the caſe betwixt your Church and the Magiſtrate? It not being likely he may be readily induced to Reſcind that new aſſerted Supremacy (which he takes for a Flower of his Crown:) And it not being lawful for you (according to this principle) during the Non-Retractation of that Supremacy, to receive any favour of his hand, were it even to an Univerſal Indulgence, or Eſta-

bliſhment of the Presbyterian party and Government, among themſelves, or in all the Land. Dear Friends! Have your Senſes exerciſed to diſcern betwixt things that differ, and ſeparate what is ſeparable in their Nature and Exerciſe: Diſtinguiſh betwixt *Gods Ordinance*, *viz.* the Magiſtrates Civil Supremacy, and *Mans annexed Corruption*, *viz.* his Spiritual and Eccleſiaſtick Supremacy: And when the former acteth its part purely, without the mixture of the latter, and contains it ſelf *intra Sphæram Debitæ Activitatis*, within its proper bounds (as it did in the matter of this Indulged Liberty, abſtracted from the Reſtrictions and Impoſitions annexed, and in ſo far only it is accepted) what hinders, but ye and your Brethren might take the benefit of its favourable Acts, notwithſtanding it lodgeth in the ſame Crown with the other? Yea, though they did put forth both their Actings beſide other, in different points, in one and the ſame Complex Law? As was in that Ordinance of the Engliſh Parliament, *Anno* —— for ſetting up of Presbyterian Government, with Reſervation of Appeals from the Church-Judicatories to the Parliament. Here is an Act of that mixture and complexion we ſpeak of, yet your Brethren in *England* wiſely diſtinguiſhed and ſeparated the Good from the Evil, Embracing the one, and Rejecting the other.

§. If any be againſt Diſtinguiſhing and Separating betwixt theſe things ſo vaſtly different, which they ſuppoſe to be ſo confounded and complicated now in the ſame Supremacy, that they cannot well be put aſunder; we crave leave to tell them

two

two things: One is (as is said already) That different Powers and Principles of Acting, may very well remain distinguishable and separable in their Natures and Actions, notwithstanding their Conjunction in the same Subject, as the former Instances shew: So that in this case, it is (almost) just as in the case of *Jordan* running through the Lake of *Genesareth*, with which (notwithstanding) it mixeth not, but remains pure and separate. The other thing is, that when Folk begin to cast at just distinguishing and separting the precious from the vile, as mere notional and metaphysical Abstractions, unfit for Christians or Men, (as some of you are pleased to talk:) We fear they be found Builders of *Babel*, not of *Salem*; but love who will to be Masters of Confusion, far be it from you.

But here some *Object*, That the Indulgence oweth all its Legal Being, Life, and Warranty, to the Act of Supremacy now established by Law; and therefore it cannot be abstracted from, nor the Indulgence considered without it, whereon it so much depends, as its Patron and Protector in Law; it being for the sake and safety of the Indulgence, that this Supremacy was established in the King.

Thus, we confess, some Argue, who wou'd seem very Nose-wise and prying; drawing (if their Assertion will pass for proof enough) all things done by the Magistrate about matters of Religion, to have, either directly or indirectly, Kindred and Relation to the Supremacy: Alledging what Indulgence was after the Supremacy, to be

an efflux of it, and designed for support of it; and what Indulgence was born before the Supremacy, must be drawn back to crouch under the Supremacy, for shadow and shelter in Law.

But to the Objection we *answer*, 1. This Alledgance, if true, says, that the Supremacy and Indulgence must needs be of a civil nature, not spiritual; seeing (as ye assert) both its fountain and end are civil. For, first, being of the Parliaments bestowing, who never pretended to have any other but a Civil Legal power, (and more than themselves had, they could not bequeath upon their Prince), thence it appears (upon this ground of yours) to be but of a civil alloy. Again, the end and use for which ye say this Supremacy was Enacted, was for *warranting* and *securing* the King and Council in Law, for what was past and done in the Indulgence, being a dispensing with some pœnal Statutes, and allowing some a liberty to preach contrary to such standing Laws; and for *inabling* him and them to do more of that in the future. Whereupon ye say, the Indulgence owes all its Legal life and being to this Act of Supremacy as its Charter. Whence it is plain, that ye make the Act of Supremacy to be but a Legal and Civil security for the King to grant, and Ministers to accept this Indulgence: and consequently, that the Indulgence derives nothing but *Legality*, not any *Spirituality* from that Act of Supremacy. And therefore no efflux of any Ecclesiastick Architectonick power is judged to be in it, nor does not

Homo-

Homologat the ſame; owning only what is Civil, for its Legal protection.

But paſſing this, know, 2. That this Alledgance of yours, is but a meer fiction to caſt an *odium* upon the Indulgence. How inſtruct ye this to have been the drift and end of that Act? Does not all that know the myſtery of that matter, know that it was upon another occaſion, and for another end? *viz.* to curb the inſolency of the Prelates, who thinking themſelves and their Church-dignities and power cock-ſure in Law, were become bold to ſpeak liberally of the King, and againſt his Minions, as the Archbiſhop of *Glaſgow* has done. Therefore to keep them in awe and dependance, as wholly in the Kings reverence, and conſequently obnoxious to his Minions, that Act was made, inabling the King with his Council to alter their eſtabliſhed frame of Church-Government, and looſe the pins of their Fabrick at his pleaſure; which then was threatned to them by ſome Stateſmen, to keep them ſober; and therefore the Biſhops were very backward to conſent to the paſſing of that Act, till awed thereunto. That this was the *profeſſed* end of the Act, can (as we are ſurely informed) be atteſted by the prime movers in it. So that, whether the Indulgence had been or not, this Act would have been to put the diſpoſal of the Church-Government in the Kings lurch. Falſe and groundleſs therefore is it, and *non cauſa pro cauſa*, to ſay the Indulgence was the riſe of this Act, or that it was done in reference to the ſame. 3. Suppoſe the Indulgence had been Illegal with-

out this, or ſome other Act to warrant it, yet ſeeing ye judg the Laws that were oppoſite to this liberty were not juſt upon the matter, it ſeems ſtrange to us, that ye, who ſo much juſtifie, yea magnifie the liberty of Conventicling (which your Brethren do not condemn if rightly managed) taken at your own hand, againſt the ſame Laws, and many more, and conſequently as illegal, though not unlawful; ſhould ſo decry the Magiſtrates deed, in diſpenſing with theſe Laws, and granting your Brethren liberty of their Miniſtry. Maugre them. Is your liberty taken ſo Divine? and theirs granted, an illegitimate or Baſtard-brood, as in your papers ye call it? may not theirs be juſt and lawful, though not according to Law, as well as yours? does not this unequal dealing ſay, nothing of this ſort pleaſes you but what is taken at your own hand? and that your quarrel at the Indulgence is, that it is granted, not taken?

4. Whether the King had ſuch a Prerogative or not (before the Act) as to indulge Nonconformiſt Miniſters liberty of their Miniſtry, beſide the Laws allowance, we humbly judg is not theirs, nor your concern to debate; being *jus tertii*, viz. the Parliaments intereſt. If the thing was juſt and right in it ſelf, you and your Brethren were not to ask *quo jure*, the King took it on him? Let the Parliament ask that; was it not enough for your Miniſters acceptance of it, that the thing was good and right in it ſelf, and not ſinful upon the matter; the King being to anſwer for the legality of his own deed? and whatever

hazard

hazard the indulged might have incurred for want of the alledged legality, yet we hope ye will not say they *sinned* in taking their hazard upon the Magistrates allowance.

5. We humbly suppose the objecters of the King his not being instructed with Legal power to indulge, before the Act of Supremacy was made, may find themselves much in a mistake. Whoever questioned it to be a part of your Kings Prerogative to dispense with pœnal Statutes (we mean *in foro soli*) at least as to the execution of them? Hath it not been his uncontroverted practice, past memory of man, as to other pœnal Laws? and why should it be denied him in this kind more than in others? is not a current, uncontroverted custom, equivalent to a Law? Whereupon you know the King did several times write down before, for allowing liberty to some Ministers, but it was obstructed and suppressed by the Archbishop of St. *Andrews*, and his Complices; till at last one of you, Mr. *John Smith*, was by special and peremptory command of the King to the Council, allowed to preach at——— and some years hereafter, your first more general Indulgence came; all this while the King and Council never doubting, nor any other questioning this power of indulging. How then can ye say, that to this Act of Supremacy the Indulgence oweth its whole legal being?

Upon all therefore that hath been said, is it not most evident to be a meer mistake to think, and a groundless assertion to affirm, as ye do, That the foundation, basis, fountain, and ground-right

right of the Indulged liberty, is this Act of Supremacy; seeing (besides the reasons forementioned to disprove their affinity) this liberty did, and doth subsist without the Supremacy, and borroweth neither its natural nor moral being from this assertion of Supremacy, and hath neither Legal nor Spiritual dependance upon it? Nor is it the exercise of any other but a lawful civil Supremacy, competent to the Magistrate, before ever that new Act had a being, and for whose cause that new Act was not at all hatched, as ye would fain bear the world in hand.

Having thus cleared, that in the Indulgence (abstractly considered, as it is accepted by the Brethren) there is nothing of Erastianism, nor any sibness unto, or homologation of the so much talked of Supremacy; let none stumble at them, nor divide from them upon that score; nor declaim impetuously against them, as supporters of the unlawful Supremacy; for how groundless that imputation is, the premises may abundantly shew. For our part we cannot see how their Preaching *with* the Magistrates Tolerance and leave, can be a pillar and prop to his Ecclesiastical Supremacy, more nor your Preaching *without* his leave is. If ye fancy any *accidental* influence that may redound from theirs to uphold it; as ye can hardly name that, so may not the like be found to flow from yours, by its occasioning the setling of a military force to maintain the Supremacy, and the Hierarchy depending thereupon, and to suppress your liberty? which is the States fault, we grant; yet by you occasioned.

Con-

Conſider ſeriouſly then, that their Preaching with the Magiſtrates Civil permiſſion, is not ſo much, let be more, a prop to this Decantated Supremacy, than your Preaching without permiſſion is: (Though it can be juſtly attributed to neither.) And let out-crys on this head, go, and indulge not your humours, while ye cry out upon this Indulgence! nor ſtate your ſelves Judges paramount and infallible, as if you had a Supremacy over all perſons, and in all cauſes, while ye go about unjuſtly to task your Brethren with Communion with this juſtly lamented Supremacy.

But if ſtill ſome cannot part with that high-ſounding word of *Supremacy*, and ſtill will be imputing the indulged liberty to Supremacy, uſing that ambiguous word as a *Gorgons* Head, or Bugbear to fright the vulgar by, and ſcare people at the Licenſed Miniſters; will they be intreated to deal as candidly in their diſcourſes, as ſome of you have done in their publick Papers, to diſtinguiſh betwixt the Civil Supremacy (whence the Indulgence flows), and the Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy (with which it hath no affinity), and then the ſnare were broken. But to talk of Supremacy in the general, and thence to inſinuate a compliance by the accepted Indulgence, with the Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy in ſpecial, is to argue *a genere ad ſpeciem, affirmative*, (from a general to a particular, affirmatively), which is fallacious and unfair dealing.

And finally, what better reaſoning is it to ſay (as ſome do), That becauſe the Magiſtrate nominates

minates in the ſecond Indulgence ſuch and ſuch Miniſters to preach in ſuch or ſuch a place, if they and the people pleaſe to have it ſo, without impoſing a neceſſity or compulſion upon them thereunto; therefore he takes upon him the Election of Miniſters, and judging of their Qualifications and fitneſs for theſe places, and conſequently (ſay ye) he acts in this Eraſtianiſm and Supremacy.

For removing this miſtake, *firſt*, as to the Nomination, conſider, (1) This doth not concern theſe of the firſt Indulgence, who were pitched upon, nominate, preſented, and petitioned for, by ſome repreſenting the Pariſh, before the Council Licenſed them to the place.

Conſider (2) that the Nomination of Miniſters in the ſecond Indulgence, was primarily a Nominating of them to confinement in the place, and but ſecondarily to the free liberty of Exerciſe of their Miniſtry there; but not to ſtate them in the relation of Paſtors to thoſe people. The peoples call doth this.

(3) Suppoſe in this troubled and unſetled ſtate of the Church, the Magiſtrate had nominate them to be Paſtors there, what is that but what the *Books of Diſcipline* of the Church of *Scotland* allows in ſuch Exigents, as in the forecited place, *Book* 1. *pag.* 37. *For this preſent* (ſay they) *we think it expedient, that either your Honours by your ſelves* Nominate *ſo many as may ſerve the forewritten Provinces, or that ye give Commiſſion to ſuch men as ye ſuppoſe the fear of God to be in, to do the ſame. And the ſame men being called into your preſence,*

ſence, ſhall be by you, and ſuch as your Honours pleaſes to call unto you for conſultation in that caſe, Appointed *to their Provinces.* Where you ſee the *Nomination* of the Superintendents, and the *Deſignation* of their Province is given to the Council for that juncture, yea, and they to be called *Coram*, and *in præſentia*, in the face of Council to be *appointed* to their *Charges*. And Charges were they much beyond what your Brethren pretend to in the places of their confinement. Nor was it here thought a ſubjecting the Miniſtry to the Magiſtrate, or putting on him an Eraſtian power, or a renouncing Chriſt, and a taking of the Miniſtry from the Magiſtrate by a new Commiſſion, For Miniſters to appear Perſonally before the Council, and be appointed to Provinces: Will you ſay, your Church here eſtabliſheth Eraſtianiſm, or a ſinful Supremacy? or allows an encroachment upon the Church and peoples Right? And does not your *Presbyterian* Writers, ſuch as Mr. *Bowels* in his *Paſtor Evangelicus*, *Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 1. allow the like?

(4) Whatever pretence this Nomination might have of *oppreſſing* the liberty of the people; yet we wonder ye count it *Eraſtianiſm*, being no Act of Church-Government, no exerciſe of the power of the Keys; elſe when people, to whom no power of the Keys belongs more than to the Magiſtrate, does nominate and elect a Miniſter to themſelves, they ſhould Eraſtianly uſurp and invade the Government of the houſe of God. Your own Divines aſſert Election to be a matter of *Liberty* or *priviledg*, not a *power of Juriſdiction.*

Next,

Next, as for the Magistrates alledged judging of Ministers Qualifications and fitness for places, we presume to propose four things to be considered:

(1) Whereupon ground ye this plea? what Act of Judicial cognition, or definitive Determination concerning your Brethrens gifts, did the Magistrate put forth?

(2) What judging upon Ministers Qualifications did the Council here exercise more than in the forecited case of their Nominating and Appointing the Superintendents to their Provinces? or, then people does, when they elect a Minister to themselves?

(4) To clear all, distinguish betwixt a *Charitative*, or *Discretive* judgment, and a *Judicial*, *Forensick*, *Definitive* judgment. The former (*viz.* a judgment of *Discretion*) is not, ye know, to be denied to any man or people concerned, much less to a Christian Magistrate: and more than that, yours did not take upon them; yea, nor that either, but supposed these Ministers able and qualified, being before tried and ordained by Presbyteries, to no less eminent Charges than now they were indulged unto. And for the latter, (*viz.* the judgment of *Jurisdiction*, which is properly the work of Church-Judicatories) they medled not therewith. What then did they in this matter, without their sphere? If ye *say*, by his Majesties Letter they were appointed to License only *Sober* and *Peaceable* men; and is not this to judg of their Qualifications?

Ans. Manifest it is, that that is meant only of some

some Civil or Moral Qualifications, not of Paſtoral Gifts; and this alſo they conſidered and cognoſced upon only *Diſcretively*, not by a *Judicial* and *Declarative* ſentence. Did they at all, *in foro*, Inſtitute a trial and cognition of theſe or any other their Qualifications? not at all, but contented themſeves with a Negative Teſtimony thereof, that is, if no body objected againſt their peaceableneſs. What Eraſtianiſm then, or Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy was here?

But finally, ſuppoſe the Magiſtrate had overreached and gone beyond his line, in nominating theſe Miniſters to ſuch places, and judging of their Miniſterial parts and fitneſs: What is that againſt the Miniſters themſelves, who did not, does not preach to ſuch people upon the Magiſtrates Nomination or Deſignation (except in ſo far as it imported a taking off their civil Reſtraints) but upon their own office (as their *Miſſio Poteſtativa*) and the peoples call (as the Determiner of them to officiate in that place)? neither did they ſubmit the trial of their Miniſterial Qualifications and fitneſs for ſuch a place to the Magiſtrates cognition: But as the Magiſtrate preſumed they were competently fit; ſo, they (without any Judicial Recognition of their abilities and ſuitableneſs) condeſcended upon the peoples earneſt call to imploy their Talents, whatever their meaſure were, for the edifying of that people for an *interim*. Now, upon all this, what juſt ground of out-cry is there againſt your honeſt Brethren? wherein have they homologate Eraſtianiſm, or a Spiritual Supremacy?

The

The Second Objection is, Concerning the Act of Rules or Inſtructions (ſo called) wherein the Magiſtrate does, by his Civil Authority, Statute and Ordain, that ſuch and ſuch things (already mentioned) be done and obſerved by the Indulged, under Civil pains.

This Act is Repreſented unto People (in *odium* of the Indulged Miniſters) as both moſt cenſurable upon the *Matter*, and Eraſtian in its *Nature*, and as inſeparable *Clogs*, yea *Conditions*, of their Liberty. But, Dear and Worthy in the Lord, conſider in ſober ſadneſs, what can be juſtly charged upon theſe Brethren in this matter, and what not. For our part, we cannot apprehend; and therefore wave to examine, whether this Act be formally civil, and only objectively Eccleſiaſtical, and that only in a few particulars, the reſt being Civil; or whether the Magiſtrates Error here be in the *Form*, uſurping an unjuſt Power; or only in the *Matter*, abuſing his juſt power, and miſapplying it to unjuſt purpoſes, as ſometimes he may do in civil caſes; which we think, the inverting of theſe Rules to their contrary, may help to clear. Nor is it neceſſary to dip into that Queſtion, Whether it be altogether heterogeneous and incompetent, as well as it may be inconvenient, for the Civil Ruler to make Civil Laws and Conſtitutions about the Circumſtances, Order, and Exerciſe of matters of Religion, without the previous cognizance and pre-determination of the Church thereupon; And that even in the moſt broken and ruined State of the Church, when there is no Governing-Church exiſtent, that can be

be owned. Passing also to consider, whether or no this Act be properly an Act of Pastoral Instructions (such as only Christ Jesus, and no mortal man can give to his Embassadors)? or, whether they be properly Ecclesiastical Canons (of the same formal and specifical Nature with Church-Decrees, about matters of Order)? Or, whether, they be only improperly and abusively called Instructions and Rules: As in some sense, all Laws, even Civil, are said to be Regulative and Directive of Practice? Whatever may be said to these Questions, upon the one side or the other, to excuse or condemn the Magistrates Deed, seemeth little to concern the purpose in hand; seeing your Indulged Ministers, looking upon these Statuted Rules, at least ways, as unjust upon their matter, have never embraced nor observed them, except it be in some civil points (inflicted on them as penal); and that only so far as they judged might be lawfully submitted unto, however unjustly imposed. What ground then is there, of stumbling at them, upon this Head? Does not their non-acceptance, and non-observance, of these Rules, free them of all crime supposed to be therein?

But to satisfie the Objection more fully, consider in serious sobriety, That, be this Act of Regulation as censurable as you will, yet was and is it quite *extrinsick* and *accidental* to the granting and accepting of the Indulgence; and therefore the vitiousness of the one, cannot defile the other; nay nor be so much as the Ministers *personal* guilt, unless they had closed with it, which ye know they did not. But to evidence this consideration

to be true and considerable, ponder these two things which serves to clear the point of this Act of Regulation its being extrinsick and accidental to the Indulgence.

(1) That Act of Rules is no part of the Act of Indulgence, but a distinct Act by it self, Enacted after the Indulgence, even in another meeting of the Council (as is informed) though the same day: nor was it at all legally intimated to the indulged (but lay dormant in the Council-Books) until a considerable time after their entry to their Charges. Now who can with reason think, that a Posterior Law, imposed only subsequently to their acceptance of their Liberty (for how soon so ever it was past in the Council-Books, is nothing to them, seeing *Lex non promulgata est quasi non lata*, a Law not legally intimated signifies nothing) how can it, we say, be thought to affect, burthen, and prejudice their acceptance of their Liberty, and to constitute it sinful, which was long in being before that Act of Rules came forth by Publication into the world? Hence plainly appeareth, that it is no *Constituent part* of the Indulgence, nor an *Inseparable attendant*; much less *Terms* and *Conditions* of the same, as some invidiously call them. Had it been intimated to them conjunctly with the Act of Indulgence, there had been some more appearance of its being an *Onus Libertatis*; but since it was not so, who can say with any shew of reason, that it was a burthen affecting their liberty, and that their acceptance of the one was a compliance with the other? Suppose a man purposed to dispone his

Estate

Estate to another, with such or such a provision or burden of Legacy, Debt, or service upon it; if this Claule was not inserted into the Disposition, nor therewith delivered in a Paper apart unto the Successor; but the Disposition was at first *sine omere*, pure, free, and unconditional, as it was drawn up, subscribed and delivered unto the man; yet sometime the Rester, the Cedent, thinks fit to add in a new Paper apart, such a burden and clog to his former disposition, intending to affect his Assignee with it. Now who will not think such a Posterior oneration altogether extrinsick to the disposition, and no ways to affect the Estate or Successor? And that the Assignee's acceptance of, or adherence to the foresaid disposition, does no ways Homologate that subsequent addition, nor oblige him in Law to own it (if gratitude and kindness constrain him not thereto); but still he stands free of, and unconcerned in that new-added burden? It signifies nothing here to say, that the Disponent never intended to dispone his Estate otherwise than with that burden; but in his mind, or some private personal deed lying by him, he *purposed* from the beginning to have his Successor affected with it, as a condition annexed to the disposition; yea, and perhaps talked of it to many; so that the Cessioner was not Physically ignorant of his mind and matter. What then? does his purpose, or private separate deed, infer any obligation upon his Assignee? or private significations of his mind, import any thing in Law without Legal and timous Intimation? No surely. The Cessioner is

ſtill free. Is it not juſt ſo in your Brethrens caſe? How can they be ſaid to have accepted their Liberty *cum onere*, ſeeing there was no ſuch terms propoſed to them *in* the Act of Indulgence delivered to them, nor *with it* at their acceptance? (as the extracts of their Licenſes ſent to them will teſtifie.) And theſe Inſtructions (ſo called) was not intimated to them, till long after they were in poſſeſſion of their liberty; and when intimated, refuſed; nor was it equitable they ſhould have abandoned the favour of their liberty, upon the intimation of theſe Rules to them; becauſe not propoſed (even then) as terms, but impoſed as Laws. And alſo being ſupervenient, like a ſuperfœtation, and conſequently extrinſick and accidental to the favour. If ye *ſay*, The Magiſtrates impoſing them by way of Laws, was but out of State, as counting it below him to ſeek their conſent thereunto.

Anſ. May ye not ſay the ſame of all Laws? and ſo threap upon the ſubjects, that they are terms, though no conſent be explicitely ſought? which were abſurd. Again, know, that when the Council minds to deal with any, even a ſingle perſon, by way of terms, they do not count it below them to require conſent, yea ſubſcription: As in ſome of your baniſhed Miniſters caſe, who was required to, and did ſubſcribe their own Act of Baniſhment; and ſome others of you at home, for redeeming their Liberty from Proceſs, were required, and did take the Oath of Supremacy. But to leave this: we only add, If ye by your avowed and bold alledging the Indulgence to be granted

granted and accepted upon the terms of obſerving their Rules, do teach the Biſhops (who will like well to confirm you in your Arguments and Objections, thereby to blow at the coal of your Animoſities and Contentions) and put it in their heads to ſpeak in the ſame language, blame your ſelves for it, but uſe it not as a Teſtimony againſt your Brethren, not being witneſſes (in the caſe) without juſt exception.

If, finally, ye *Object*, that the Kings Letter concerning the firſt Indulgence, comprehended in the boſom of it an order alſo concerning the Inſtructions which after followed; and conſequently theſe Inſtructions cannot be divided from the Act of Indulgence, in conſidering Miniſters acceptance thereof.

Anſ. That Letter of his Majeſties to the Council, was to them directed (not to the Miniſters) as the Councils Rule and Warrant, not the Miniſters Legal Act of Indulgence; and therefore (whatever was in it) it did concern the Miniſters no further than was legally communicate unto them; and this at firſt was only in a very ſimple and unconditionate, or unclogged Act of Licenſe, as the Copies thereof under the Clerks hand ſent unto them, evidenceth. The Injunctions were not intimated unto them till upwards of a year thereafter. Now it's only the Councils Act put into the Miniſters hand, which is the publick legal deed wherein they are concerned; the Kings Letter, though Regiſtrate in the Council-Books, is a private matter as to them, as for any thing not intimate unto them. Whatever they did

Physically know thereof (by private information), which these not indulged also knew) signifies nothing; at least no more to them than to others. So that still it is plain the Indulgence was *sine onere*.

If it be said, The Kings Letter was read to the first Ten indulged, when they were called before the Council; and did not their silence, and not bearing Testimony against these Injunctions, and other things of the like nature, import an Homologation thereof?

Ans. Besides that the matter of fact alledged is much questioned, yea plainly denied as false, let us suppose the Letter to have been *all* and whole read to them, yet the speech delivered by one in name of the rest, by shewing positively how they held their Ministry, did (in all sober mens judgment) sufficiently (though indirectly) intimate their disallowance of all things repugnant thereunto; for, *Rectum est norma, & index sui & obliqui.* But suppose they failed in not being plain, full and free enough in their Testimony, is that a ground sufficient to charge the odious imputation of Erastianism on them? or to illegitimate their indulged Liberty, or their Ministry, so as it were unlawful to hear them? or what is it to the rest of the Brethren, who were never called before the Council, nor the Letter and its Contents read to them? must the failing of some few be cast upon all? and all alike condemned as guilty? O what partial and unjust dealing is this?

(2) Consider the form or quality of these Statuted Rules; viz. That they were not *proposed* to

to them, as prerequired, or simultaneous, or future *conditions* of their Liberty; but *imposed as Laws*, and authoritatively enjoined under Civil pains, Penalties and Certifications, like other Laws.

Suppose then they had been antecedently unto, or conjunctly with the grant of their Liberty, intimated unto them (which yet was not); yet seeing they were not proposed as terms, by way of Bargain required to be approved and consented unto, or observed as *Irritant conditions* of their liberty, nor promise to observe them, sought or given, nor at that time pretended or declared to be Conditions upon which the Indulgence was granted; but were simply imposed upon them *as Laws*, but not consented unto, nor accepted by them: Who can think the very making and being of such an Act, did justly bar them up from making use of the liberty granted? or doth now so affect it, or the Exercise of their Ministry by it, as that they are wholly polluted thereby? or, that the bare acceptance of that Liberty, doth necessarily and natively involve them in the guilt of that Act, and of all comprehended in it, even albeit they observe it not? Will not equitable Judges think these Rules so Enacted, were and are only the Law-givers, not the Ministers sin, no more than the Law enjoining and appointing the *Declaration*, or Abjuration of your Covenants, to be taken by all Magistrates of Burghs, can be justly interpreted to fix guilt upon every one that happeneth to bear that Office, albeit he conform not to that Law? Who will

charge such a Magistrate as guilty of accepting the Office *cum onere*, with the burden of the legally annexed Declaration? and that his separating between the Office and the Declaration, is morally impossible, and but a cheat? or, that his bearing Office in this case is an Homologating the Act anent the taking of the Declaration, as ye do charge your Brethrens acceptance of the indulged liberty, in reference to that Act of Rules? Certainly it were no small wrong to such honest Magistrates, your selves being judges, to charge them with that guilt. And is not your Brethrens case just the same? Add hereto, put the case the Council emitted an Edict licensing and allowing Conventicles to be kept in House or Fields (while there is no access to your Churches) adding withall, certain Rules and Restrictions of an Erastian nature, and favouring of the asserted Supremacy, in its most spiritual part; would ye therefore have judged your selves obliged to have forborn Conventicling upon that account, or yet to give it over? or, that ye sinned if ye did Conventicle, meerly because of the Injunction of those Rules, albeit ye observed them not? We suppose not. And is not this a like case with your Brethrens, as to the point in hand? pray you then, have not divers weights, and divers measures.

And yet the more strongly does this defence militate for your Brethren, that these restrictive and encroaching Impositions were not antecedent unto, nay nor concomitant with their Indulgence, (as is before said) but subsequent even

to

to their entry, and long after, even for ſome years after the firſt Indulgence, and many a Month after the ſecond. And do ye think in reaſon, that upon the intimation thereof unto them at that after-time, they ſhould have given over their Miniſtry for that very cauſe? If that were a Relevant reaſon, then were it eaſie for the Magiſtrate, when he pleaſed, to lay aſide all Miniſters, you as well as them, by making and impoſing ſuch kind of Laws and Acts of Rules upon you. Was and is not non-obedience ſufficient to diſcharge them of compliance therewith, as is reckoned in the caſe of other Laws, albeit publickly and ſolemnly promulgated? Yea, to this non-obſervance of theſe Inſtructions, remember to add this, that in *July* ——— *Anno* ——— 1673, in face of Council, when thoſe Rules were intimated unto many of them, it was declared by them, that they could not obſerve them, but ſhould rather ſubmit to whatſoever penalty or puniſhment, as the written Narrative of their carriage at that time doth atteſt. So that when they were intimated unto them, if ye call them the condition of their Liberty, you ſee that *Recuſabant onus & conditionem repudiabant.*

All which things impartially conſidered, it is hoped whatever evil be in that Act, yé will let it reſt upon the Authors, and not impute it to the Miniſters, being ſo innocent of compliance with it by any Rule of Scripture or right reaſon. Oh then away with theſe hideous out-crys, which are made amongſt the people upon this ſcore, by ſome Trafficking Novices, and their Pragmatical

Follow-

Followers; who teazle up this Act to the height of all imaginable wickedneſs, and then Applyes it to the Miniſters, to make them odious; dealing herein with them, as the Heathen did with ſome Chriſtians in the Primitive Perſecutions, who firſt clothed them up in Wolves Skins and Bears Skins, and then hunted their Maſtives at them, which did run upon them, as not men, but wild Beaſts of the Wilderneſs, and ſo did tear them into pieces. Ah ſad! to ſee the like done to honeſt men, by pretending Friends, but herein real Foes, dreſſing them up in foul miſ-repreſentations, to egg on peoples envy and wrath againſt them, and all to break and tear their Miniſtry down! Is there any perſecution or grief like to this? Oh that our Heads were Rivers of Tears, to mourn for ſuch unparallel'd Animoſities, which, all things conſidered, hath ſcarce ever had its like!

The Third Objection is, Some alledge this Indulged Preaching with the Magiſtrates permiſſion and allowance, to be a Renouncing their former Commiſſion from Jeſus Chriſt, and their dependance upon him, and a taking from the Magiſtrate a new Commiſſion, and an holding of their Miniſtry of him, with ſubjection to him, and dependance upon him, like other Civil Judges of the Land, and Miniſters of State.

Anſw. Ah bitter and groundleſs Cenſure! nor could we have believed ſuch an Imputation would have been laid upon the Indulged by any Perſon of a ſpark of Reaſon and Religion, yea or of common ſenſe, had not our Eyes ſeen, and our Ears heard it. But to the matter we ſay,

1. Dear

1. Dear Friends, How prove ye this charge? Is confident asserting, enough to ground such an heavy Accusation? If your Brethren have unawares committed such an Abomination, O why do ye not run to them, and plead with them about it, to save them from the Error of their Way? Why have ye not ere now seriously Remonstrated this dreadful guilt to themselves, and not whispered it in corners unto others? Certainly, to deal with them at this rate behind their backs, to speak or write this of them unto others, First, for a long time by private Suggestions and Surmises among the People, then by Missive Letters and Libellous Papers; and yet never to have waired a Word or Line upon themselves, with any reason, to evince the Charge: What Spirit savoureth this of, and to what good can it tend, even your selves being Judges? And till the Charge be proved, is it not a sufficient answer to deny it? But for further Vindication and Satisfaction (for we hope it is but a mistake, there are such hard thoughts taken up of them) we humbly propose to you,

2. Were the Priests and Levites in *Hezekiah*'s days guilty of this Charge, because they had, by the Magistrates Authority, access to their service of the Temple, and did make use of the same? Was their Office altered or innovate, and quite spoiled thereby, as if they renounced their dependance upon God, their Lord, and Head, and Master, and subjected their Function to the Civil Ruler, and took it holden of him, because of his Supervenient Civil Liberty granted them? Or, were the Levites subordinate to *Jehoshaphat*, like other Civil

Civil Judges, becauſe of his, not only permitting, but appointing them to go Preach through the Land? And does not your Miniſters hold as little of the Magiſtrate as theſe did? Can any with truth ſay, that the Prince his Permiſſion or Ratification of the exerciſe of their Office, or their uſe-making of the ſame, implies a Renunciation of Chriſt, or Reſignation of their Office into the Kings hands for a *Novodamus*? How will ſuch a Paradox-Point be made out?

3. Will you ſay, Becauſe ye were outed of your Charges by the Magiſtrates Interdict of the Act at *Glaſgow*, *Anno* 1662. or other the like, and did Ced thereunto, that therefore you did hold your Miniſtry of him (like other Judges and Officers of State) and were deprived of it by him? If not, What more does your Brethrens Civil Licenſe ſtate them in ſubordination unto, and dependdance upon him, than your quitting of your Charges at his command did you? For, outing and ining of Miniſters ſeems to be of the ſame Category, and to argue a like dependance.

4. Diſtinguiſh (as *Apollonius* and other Anti-Eraſtian Divines do) betwixt the *Subſtance* of the Miniſtry, or the Function it ſelf, and the *Exerciſe* thereof. Your Miniſters, by their Indulgence, has not their Function or Office derived from the Magiſtrate; by it they do not Renounce their old Office, Maſter, and Head, Jeſus Chriſt, nor get any new Office, or Miniſterial Power conferred upon them by the Magiſtrate, prove the contrary if ye can: Yea, the Tenor of the Act of Indulgence will declare it; being a *permitting* them to Preach,

not

not a *giving* them *power* to Preach; and therefore falſe is the Charge above alledged. All that they hold of the Magiſtrate, is only ſomewhat about the exerciſe of their Function; ſomewhat like an Embaſſadors getting a Paſs from another Prince, to paſs through or ſtay in his Territories without Lett or Moleſtation; or to diſcharge his Embaſſy within that Dominion, unto ſome certain Perſons he is ſent unto. Does that Embaſſador, by taking this ſafe Conduct or Leave of the Prince of the Bounds, quit his own proper Maſter, and take Commiſſion-power of that other Prince? No, no. Now as to this ſort of Dependance which Miniſters have upon the Magiſtrate, in the Actual Diſcharge of their Office, for clearing thereof, diſtinguiſh next between the exerciſe of the Miniſtry *ſimply* and *in it ſelf* conſidered, and the *circumſtances* of that Exerciſe: Or, Diſtinguiſh Subordination into that which is *Abſolute*, and that which is only *ſecundum quid*, or in ſome certain reſpects. Now, as by this Indulgence, your Miniſters do not depend upon the Prince *Eſſentially* and *Derivatively*, as to their *Office*, and *Authority*, and *Matter* of their Embaſſage; ſo neither *ſimply* and *abſolutely* for the *exerciſe* of it (both theſe they have and hold immediately of Chriſt alone) but only and merely in regard of the *Circumſtance* and Adjunct of the peaceableneſs and *Legal Immunity* of the publick exerciſe of it in ſuch and ſuch places of his Realm: Even as the exerciſe of the Proteſtant Religion, being Authorized by Law, dependeth upon him; and as the exerciſe of your Miniſtry within any Family, dependeth upon the Maſter of the Family.

ly. And your ſelves, in your Papers upon this Subject, acknowledge this kind of Subordination and Dependance (*viz.* in reſpect of the publick, free, peaceable, exerciſe of the Miniſtry) to be not unlawful. To this *Apollonius* alſo accordeth, *Part laſt, Sect.* 2. *Cap.* 3. Neither is it to be thought that this does ſubject the *Miniſtry*, but the *Man*; not the Function, but the Perſon, to the Civil Power; except it be (as ſome of your ſelves ſay) *in obliquo*, Indirectly, and Objectively, even as the other matters of God are, being Objects about which his Imperative and Coercive Power is converſant.

Thus ye ſee that it is only in reſpect of Circumſtances of the exerciſe of their Miniſtry (at moſt) wherein the Indulged depend upon the Magiſtrate, and that that is no abſurdity, nor no ground for your objected Alledgance: being not unlike to this caſe; as if an Embaſſador of another King or State, were ſent to your King, or any part of his People; albeit in his Authority and Embaſſy he depend not upon your King, but allanerly upon his own Maſter; yet is it not in your King's power, and dependeth upon him, whether he will admit him in his Territories to diſcharge that Meſſage? Or, when and where he ſhall have Audience, *&c?* Ay, but your Parallel of Civil Judges and their Offices depending on the King, correſponds not adequately unto this, but is of a different nature and wider extent, being otherwiſe ſubordinate unto, and depending upon the Prince, *viz. Directly and Derivatively* as well as *Objectively*; and conſequently he hath a power over them, which

he

he hath not over Indulged Miniſters, *viz.* to *exauctorate* and *diveſt* them of their Office at his pleaſure, as well as to thruſt them from the *exerciſe* thereof within his Dominions; whereas, as he doth not make the Indulged to be Miniſters, ſo neither can he unmake and unminiſter them: All he can take from them is, what he giveth, *viz.* his own Civil Toleration.

From all which it is apparent, How groundleſs this Objection is; They retaining and exerciſing their very former Miniſtry which they had of Chriſt; and getting no other, no new Miniſtry from the Magiſtrate, no more than your ſelves do, and conſequently are Chriſts Embaſſadors and Sent-ſervants ſtill, even as you are; only they have the peaceableneſs and civil freedom of the publick exerciſe of their Function from the Ruler: A thing they were and are bound to pray for, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2.——*That under him they may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godlineſs and honeſty*; and conſequently, or by parity of Reaſon, *in the exerciſe of their Miniſtry.* And if this may and ſhould be prayed for, as it is his duty to grant it, ſo it cannot be their crime to accept it.

The Fourth Objection is, From the Magiſtrates deſign in granting this Indulgence, which deſign ye ſuppoſe to have been evil, and conſequently its fruit evil, and not to be medled with.

Anſw. What is that Project ye ſuſpect? And how is your Alledgance verified and made out? Surely, Liberty to Preach the Goſpel, *in it ſelf* (and *ex conditione operis*) could be of no ill tendency, natively. Whatever then may be deemed

to

to have been the *Finis Operantis*, or Sinister Intention of the Granter, what is that to the thing it self, being so good, so necessary? And the Agents Design being altogether extrinsick to it? Doth the Permitters Latent Intention defile the mercy, that it might not be touched? Or, what is it to any that takes the favour, and makes good use of it, and concurreth not with the alledged ill Design? When *Julian* the Apostate gave an universal illimited Toleration to all Religions, and among the rest, to all Sects of Christians, on purpose that the several parties among the Christians, being hot in their Differences and Animosities amongst themselves, might by their mutual Digladiations and Contests, weaken and wear out one another, and so consume the Christian Religion at last with their own hands; did the Orthodox Christians ever scruple, or ought they to have refused, to take their share of that Tolerated Liberty, either because of the Sin of the vast extent of it to all Sects, or because of the evil design thereof? No, no, but accepted and improved what was their part, not being concerned in the Emperors part (further than to sympathize with Gods Honour and Interest wronged by him) but leaving the sin of his ill designs upon himself.

But to be more particular: What suppose ye the Evil Design to be? And why do ye not convince your Brethren of it? And of their Accession to it, if any be? We find some talk of three several Designs: Let us consider them severally.

First, Some say, It was designed to be a Wedg of Division.

To

To this we *Answer*, 1. How could a thing, in it self so innocent, have any just and native tendency to such an end? Doth the permitting or taking of Liberty to Preach the Gospel, *intrinsically*, and *ex natura Rei*, level at dividing the Ministers and Professors of the Gospel? What a Paradox were it to assert that? Any Tendency then it might be supposed to have hereunto, must be only *ex Accidenti*, through your Corruptions, Opposition, and Discontents, which might have been imagined likely to stir thereupon; at least, through the weakness and proneness to mistake, that some of you might be under. And thus the best of things may be an occasion to mens humors and mistakes to work upon, and so become a Ball of Contention. But should the innocent Object bear the blame of your Corruptions rising? Moreover, If ye took this to be the Design, Why were and are ye so unwise and unjust, as your selves to co-operate with that design with both your hands, and carry it on so eagerly by Renting and Separation? Why are ye so subservient thereunto by your contradiction and contention about the Indulgence? Had it not been as well your wisdom as duty, to have defeated their Design by your constant *Unity*, (though ye could not be of Unanimity?) Sith then, this Indulged Liberty is not properly a *Cause*, but simply an *Occasion* of dividing (as Christ our Lord himself sometime was, *John* 9. 16.) but the true and proper cause is your Corruptions, such as Male-content, Short-sightedness, *&c.* who can justly quarrel at that which in it self is a mercy, because of the ill use Dividers and their ill humors

make of it, more than at the Gospel, which is oft a Stumbling-stone and Rock of Offence, set for the falling of many? And who are most to be blamed? whether these who are *Active* in Dividing upon this occasion, *Rom.* 16. 17. or, the Indulged, who are more *passive*, and an innocent occasion of the same, through their necessary use-making of the liberty of the exercise of their Calling? *Matth.* 15. 12. Certainly, the Indulged and Unindulged might well have abode in Unity, notwithstanding of the difference of their Lots, and various capacities of Acting in the Gospel, as well as those that go abroad Conventicling; and those that necessarily stay at home, may and should remain nevertheless one in the Lord, and in Christian Love and Peace.

But to remove the Objection further, we demand, 2. How does it appear that this was the scope of granting the Indulgence? May every man abound in his own Sense, and fasten that upon it which his roving Fancy leads him to dream to have been the purpose of it? *De occultis non judicat Ecclesia*; Secret things belong to the Lord, revealed things only to us; *De non-entibus & non-apparentibus, idem judicum:* Surely, the Ruler professed no such end, as the Act declares; and secret ends fall not under our Judgment, nor alters the nature of things. Since then, the *Patent*, not the *Latent* ends of things; their certain and declared Scope, and not our imaginary, fictitious, or conjectural Suspicions, are the just measure of Judging and Acting; it is hoped that upon serious review of this, ye will cease quarrelling your Brethren upon

upon this Head. Otherwiſe, if ſtill you make the latent and conjectured ends of Agents, the meaſuring-line of the goodneſs of things, as to others uſe-making thereof, what if ſome ſagacious people or Miniſters ſhould take up that ſame Argument againſt your ſelves, and tell you they are jealous (not without pregnant preſumptions) of no good ends in ſome of your Preachers and their Preachings, and therefore judgeth it unlawful to hear them, join with them, or any way countenance them therein? Would you think it valid reaſoning? And were ye not but met with your own Ell-wand?

2. Some are bold to *ſay*, The intent of the Indulgence was to ſubject the Miniſtry and things of God unto, and bring them all into dependance upon the Civil Magiſtrate; and, therefore not lawful to meddle with that that ſerves for ſuch an end.

Anſ. Had this been ſaid of the Outing of you, it might had more colour; the Exerciſe of, and ſubmitting unto the Magiſtrates *privative* power, *circa ſacra*, tending more natively hereunto. But how this can be juſtly alledged of the Exerciſe and acceptance of the benefit of his *Auxiliary* power and act of his Nurſe-Fatherſhip, in indulging part of that liberty formerly taken from you, we ſee not.

Again, as *ex natura rei*, it puts Miniſters into ſubjection unto, and dependance upon the Magiſtrate, not in regard of their Function, nor of the Exerciſe of it ſimply; but only in regard of the free and undiſturbed Exerciſe thereof,

(which the Objectors themſelves grant to be not incongruous), ſo neither doth this end *appear* (by any Demonſtrative Evidence) to have been the Project. No mans gueſſing, and Magiſterial Alledgances, ſufficeth here for proof. *Non-conſtat's* and *Non-liquet's* may very well be repell'd as *Non-entities*, ſpecially if there are preſumptions to the contrary, as here there are.

3*ly*. Some more colourably *Object*, That the very profeſſed end of this Indulgence (as the Act beareth) is to remedy (or remove) Conventicles, which the Act calls Diſorders. And is not this an evil end? And to accept that Indulgence, is it not to comply with that end?

For *Anſwer* to this, conſider, (1) That the Act calleth Conventicles Diſorders, only in a *Civil* ſenſe, or in point of Law, being againſt the ſtanding Laws; not in a *moral* ſenſe, or in point of Conſcience, this is abſtracted from; as the former cannot be denied to be *de facto* true, though the Law forbidding them is not indeed to be juſtified.

Conſider (2) that this excluding of Conventicles by the Act, ſeems rather the intent of the Confinement, as the Tenor of the Act manifeſts; but the intent of the Indulgence plainly appears to be, to mollifie the confinement. And therefore though the Argument might plead againſt ſtrict obſerving of the confinement, yet no ways againſt the Indulgence.

Conſider, (3) That ſuppoſe this to have been the intention of the *Granter* of the Indulged Liberty, yet it cannot be the native tendency of the

thing

thing granted, seeing Liberty of publick Preaching is not contrary unto, but may well consist with private Conventicling too, when need and occasion requireth. *Subordinata non pugnant.* If any assert them incompatible and destructive the one to the other, either in the same person, or in divers, do they not injure and reflect upon Conventicling, as well as upon the indulged free exercise of publick Preaching?

(4) Giving and not granting, that this indulged Liberty did exclude Conventicling *pro tanto*, that is, in so far as it gets place, (and further it cannot be supposed to be intended to seclude them than in these places who get the benefit of it), what prejudice were this to the Pastor or people who enjoy it? being no other but a commutation or exchange of a lesser good for a greater? For clearing this, remember that Conventicling (so called) and Indulged Preaching differ, not in substance, but in mode, accidents, and circumstances only, *viz.* the one is a publick, peaceable, free, allowed way of Preaching, without hazard of the Law or violence; the other a private way; or if publick, lyable to the lash of the Law, and the violence and disturbance that may happen thereupon: the one hath the conveniency of a publick Meeting-house; the other hampered in a private corner, or exposed in the fields to the injuries of the weather. The one has access to the legal maintenance; the other is cast upon peoples benevolence, and burdensome to their private purse, *&c.* Now which of these Circumstances are most eligible to enjoy

the Goſpel in? Who will ſay then, that there is any wrong done to a Miniſter or people, if in lieu of their hazardous, &c. Conventicling, they get Indulgence of free, &c. Preaching?

The fault then here ſeems to be, not that there is an Indulgence inſtead of Conventicling in ſome places, but that the Indulgence is not extended to all perſons and places without exception, that ſo all might enjoy the liberty of publick, peaceable Preaching and Hearing of the Goſpel, without moleſtation or hazard, as theſe few do. And thus your ſelves ſay, in your Profeſſions and Petitions to the Magiſtrate for a General Liberty, that that granted, Conventicles would ceaſe a while; meaning in ſo far as they are in oppoſition, and not in ſubordination unto the publick Ordinances, according to the Rule, *Deſiderium boni imperfectioris ceſſat, acquiſito perfectiori.* Doubtleſs, when publick liberty is denied, Houſe-Preaching (rightly gone about) cannot be condemned. But if any take up the conceit, that as theſe Modes of Preaching are in themſelves lawful, and in ſome caſes neceſſary; ſo are they always neceſſary, yea and perferable to the moſt extended Indulged Liberty: who will not think them under ſome dotage? And indeed, if Conventicling (ſo called) were ſo preferable, much more if it were the only bleſſed way (as ſome talk), then would it follow, that the Magiſtrate had done you no wrong in thruſting you from your publick ſtations into corners and trouble; nor yet did they you wrong in keeping you there, caſting you thereby upon the neceſſity of ſo Conventicling;

nor

nor ſhould he do well to reſtore you and the Church to your former ſtate, becauſe it would infer a wearing out of Conventicles. How unreaſonable then muſt this principle and exception of yours be, judg ye your ſelves!

(5) Conſider, that howbeit this *Remedying* of Conventicles as *Legal Diſorders*, be put into the Narrative of the Act, and ſuppoſe it were ill, (as indeed we will be far from juſtifying any that condemn thoſe honeſt meetings of the Lords people, which have been ſo much owned of him), yet Miniſters compliance with that part of the Statutary part of the Act, which permits them liberty of Preaching, cannot rationally be judged to involve them in the guilt of what is in the Narrative. Becauſe Narratives of Laws expreſs only the grounds and reaſons moving the Magiſtrate to enact ſuch a Law, not the reaſon of the ſubjects. And conſequently, if the *Ratio motiva*, or motive inducing the Legiſlator to ſuch a Statute be ſinful, the guilt thereof reſts with himſelf, but doth not reflect upon the ſubject; as might be cleared by ſeveral examples. And indeed, otherwiſe it were eaſie for the Magiſtrate to bind you up in Conſcience from all neceſſary Duties of Religion, by commanding or permitting them upon bad Narratives and ends. Know, that the Law tells us, *Quod continetur in Lemmate legis, ad Cæſarem, non ad ſubditum proprie ſpectat.* It ſufficeth then to warrant the ſubject to give obedience, if the Statutary part be lawful as to the *Matter*, and the *Authority* enjoining the ſame be competent. Specially if withal they competently

peremptorily declare and teſtifie their diſallowance of theſe grounds the Magiſtrate goes upon.

(6) This holds yet more ſtrongly, when the caſe is not of a preceptive, but a permiſſive Law: and the thing permitted, not an indifferent thing, but a neceſſary duty, as in this caſe it is. For example, let us ſuppoſe the Ruler had made an Act, like that of *Darius*'s, *Dan.* 6. 7. diſcharging all Preaching, (as he did Prayer to God), and the Reſter ſhould grant liberty of all ſort of Conventicling, upon this ground and intent, to wear out and put away all Preaching in a ſetled way, would ye think he that ſhould Preach, were it but in a corner, were guilty of this ſinful Narrative and end? we ſuppoſe not. Or, if he ſhould diſcharge all Family-prayer, and the Reſter licenſe it, upon this Narrative, and with reſpect to this end, that it might ſatisfie people, and exclude all ſeeking after publick Preaching, *&c.* would it in that caſe be unlawful to perform Family-Prayer? Or, would doing the ſame, conclude you under the guilt of compliance with the Narrative and grounds whereupon the Ruler permits it? we ſuppoſe ye will not ſay it. And why any more ſhould ye aver it in this caſe of the indulged Preaching, which is no leſs a neceſſary and commanded duty, than that of indulged Praying, *&c?*

Thus you ſee how little ground there is to ſcruple at the Indulgence, or queſtion the Indulged upon this ſcore, of a ſuppoſed ill deſign in it.

The Fifth *Objection* is, The narrowneſs of the

In-

Indulged Liberty, both as to *Perſons* and *Priviledges*; not all the outed Miniſters being comprehended in that favour, nor all *places* made partakers, nor liberty of the whole *Presbyterian* Government had; but only a part of Miniſters and people has it vouchſafed on them; and no more of the Government reſtored, but only Congregationl Seſſions at moſt. And is it not a fault to accept of ſuch a ſtraitned liberty?

To this we ſay theſe five things: (1) This Objection ſupponeth the Indulgence in its nature not unlawful: elſe, how can the Objectors plead for its inlargement, or complain of its ſtraitnedneſs? for, were it intrinſecally evil, the more ample it were, the worſe it were.

But (2) know, that its ſtraitnedneſs is the Magiſtrates fault, but the Miniſters affliction only; and ſhould not the Magiſtrates fault reſt with himſelf, and not be imputed to the Miniſters? *Let every man bear his own burden*, Gal. 6. 5.

And (3) as his not granting all he ſhould, did not make it ſimply unlawful to grant a part; ſo who can rationally ſay, that Miniſters might not take, and make uſe of that part, till God ſhould incline him to grant more? Grieved was their ſouls that the liberty was not univerſal, and all perſons and places concerned not, made ſharers, all their own rights not fully reſtored. And their hearts deſire to God, and endeavour with man, was and is to have it extended. They ſit not down upon their priviledg, careleſs of their Brethren, who were ſecluded and debarred for the time; but ſympathizes and laments their hard

lot,

lot, praying for redreſs, even as they who returned out of the Captivity before the reſt, forgot not thoſe who were detain'd in *Babylon* behind them, *Pſal.* 126. 1, 2, with 4. But who will ſay, that becauſe in Providence others bonds are not taken off, therefore they ſhould have caſten at the mercy of their liberty? or, that it was their ſin to take hold of it and improve it? no more than it was *Pharaoh*'s Butlers fault to accept of his Liberty and Reſtauration, though the Baker and *Joſeph* were left ſtill in priſon behind him, *Gen.* 40? Did *Joſeph* quarrel or diſcharge the Butler to accept of his liberty, unleſs all his fellow-priſoners were partakers of the like? no, but only ſays, *When it is well with thee, then remember me.*

To ſtate this for a Principle, That it is not lawful for any man to preach the Goſpel, having liberty, while his neighbour gets not the like liberty; or, to preach in any one place, becauſe he is not licenſed equally to all places; or, that one place ſhould ſay, I will not be rained upon while other places and fleeces are dry; it ſeemeth to ſavour more of humour than of ſolid and juſtifiable reaſon. Was it a crime for the Children of *Judah* and *Benjamin* to come up out of their Captivity to *Jeruſalem* and build the Temple, offer Sacrifice, *&c.* (as *Ezra* 1. 5.) becauſe their Brethren of the Ten Tribes were not alſo permitted to return to their land, and concur in the Building? yea, or that part of the *Jews* who came up at firſt with *Zerubabel*, did they ſin, becauſe they returned, while others ſtayed ſtill in *Baby-*

Babylon, (perhaps detained, notwithstanding *Cyrus* his Proclamation) till afterwards *Esdra* obtained of *Artaxerxes* liberty for himself and them? (as *Esdra* 7. 6, 7.) or, if twenty of you were incarcerate for the Gospel, and in providence the Civil Power were moved to liberate ten of them, ought these ten necessarily to reject their offered Liberty; or were it their sin to go forth of Prison, because their Fellow Prisoners obtain not the like? Or might, and should one Nation refuse the liberty of the Gospel, because all other Nations has not the like? In a word, *where no Law is, there is no Transgression*; and what Divine Precept is broken, in accepting Liberty to Preach in the West, because *Orkney*, *Shetland*, and the High-Lands, *&c.* are not provided for, nor priviledged with the liberty of a Presbyterian Ministry? But further, Consider, (4.) That it is not left at Ministers Option or Choice, to Preach or not (having liberty) as they please. *A Dispensation is committed unto them*, 1 *Cor.* 9. 16, 17. *and wo apon them if they preach not*, having an open door from the Lord set before them, by the means of the Magistrate, who had shut it. It was and is therefore not indifferent unto them, to accept or reject the liberty and open-door of Preaching, as seemed best to them; but was, and is a necessary, indispensable duty to take hold of it. Hence it follows, that whatever Neighbourlineſs and Kindlineſs might seem to plead for Refusing, yet surely it was and is no breach of Conscience to accept, nay rather were it not a sinful, fond Affection, to slight such an opportunity of serving God in the Gospel

of

of his Son? Becauſe, forſooth, ſome Neighbours get not the like liberty, were not this too high a complement of kindneſs to your Neighbour, to prefer the taking an unneceſſary ſhare in a common ſuffering with them, unto a ſinleſs liberty of neceſſary ſerving of God in the higheſt Sphere of Goſpel-acting? In like manner, (5.) As for taking the liberty of all Chriſts Ordinances, competent to a Congregation, without liberty of Claſſical Presbyteries, Provincial Synods, or General Aſſemblies? What Scripture or Reaſon pleads againſt this, or proveth the Accepters Sin? Namely, what is withheld; being their Involuntary, and not conſented-unto want. Muſt ye have all, or will ye take nothing? Yea, and count it an unpardonable crime to accept of a *Day of ſmall things*, till God incline the hearts of Rulers to condeſcend to further? Had it been unlawful to *Zeruhabel*, to have accepted a conſiderable part of the Veſſels of the Temple, if theother part had been kept back? By this ground was not *Eſdra* in a miſtake, when he bleſſed God for a Nail in the Holy Place? *Eſdra* 9. And was not your own Church far out, when in the late Uſurpers time, and afterwards, her liberty of General Aſſemblies was broken; yet kept Synods, Presbyteries, and Seſſions, holding faſt what of her Liberty ſhe could, while the other part was infringed? Is *aut Cæſar, aut nihil*, your Principle? We hope ſuch Axioms ye will not own; nor charge the contravention thereof, as a fault upon your Brethren. Were Chriſts Cloaths taken from him, what forbids, but ye might lawfully receive back his Coat to put upon him, until

til ye get his Cloak also? Remember here, that what part of the Churches Liberties is kept back from your Ministers, is not discharged nor quail by them; nor what they have got accepted in lieu of the whole; but only taken as a part of the Churches right, till more come: Like a Creditor's receiving part of his Sum, to be doing with, for the time, until he get the rest. In all this Detension, are not your Ministers merely passive? And what they receive, is *cumulative*, and but *præjudice*, not *privative* unto what remains to be sought and granted thereafter, when God giveth occasion.

From all these Considerations, is it not plain, what a groundless stumbling there is at Ministers accepting this straitned Liberty, Lame and Narrow as it is? which imperfection of it, should be, and is indeed a *Gravamen*, a grief of heart, and burden to their Spirits; but could be no just *Ligamen Conscientiæ*, a thing to have hedged up Conscience from making use of it, or that imports a violation of the Law of God, and a Breach upon the Conscience, if it be made use of.

If any *say*, The accepting of this partiai Indulgence precludes from, and stands in the way of a more general; and if this had been refused, a full Liberty would have been granted e're now.

Answ. We confess these are Politicks strongly asserted by some who would seem very prying; but founded upon so little Reason or Religion, yea or common Sense, that it transcends our capacity to comprehend them. What probability or ground of Assurance can ye produce for such an expectation?

tion? By what Almanack do ye Divine this? yea, ſuppoſe ſome weak probables might be adduced for it, yet how can it be thought that ſuch uncertain, conjectural Politicks, relating unto Future Contingencies, ſhould juſtly have debarred theſe Miniſters from entertaining a preſent, certain Mercy and Duty? But, Dear Friends, Did ye find the firſt Indulgence bar the door upon, and not rather make way for, the ſecond? And if we might take a liberty to foretel, as you do, might it not be ſaid upon no leſs Reaſon, that, had the Second been kindly entertained and well improved, the good effects thereof might have induced many to ſeek, and the Magiſtrate to grant, a third, more ample than any of the former: But your carping diſobligeth him, and your reeling makes you contemptible, and thought unworthy of Favour.

If again any *ſay*, How can we be content, when ſome are thus favoured, and get leave to dwell at eaſe under their Vine, while others are hunted and haraſſed? We will never be right, till all be in one condition again, either all out, or all in.

Anſw. May not people object the ſame againſt one another, to whom Providence carves out various Lots? And what, Shall there be, ſhould there be no peace, until all be of the ſame outward Lot and Condition? O Salamandrin Paradox! And what is this elſe but the very foam of envy, like the Patriarchs envying *Joſeph* for their Fathers kindneſs unto him beyond them? or, as if *Joſeph* ſhould have grudged at the Butler his getting and accepting of Liberty, while himſelf lay

ſtill

ſtill in priſon, till the Irons entred into his Soul? Or, as if the reſt of the Children of the Captivity ſhould have quarrelled at *Daniel* and his Fellows promotion, while their Brethren ſate by the Banks of *Babel* weeping? *Why ſhould your eye be evil where the Lords Hand is good?* Are ye worſe that it's well, or any whit better with others? Count ye what is granted to your Brethren, detracted from you? and their Liberty, your Miſery? Why grudge ye? *Do ye well to be angry?* might not the ſuffering part of the people grudg and quarrel in like manner, that all their Neighbours are not in Priſon with them? or, that one or more gets out of Priſon, while others are detained? Should there be no peace among you, unleſs all be in the ſame caſe, and have the ſame Lot? Is not this much like the fault of the *Corinthians*, who ſchiſmatized and rent the Body of Chriſt, becauſe of their different places and employments in the Church, that all was not Eye, or Ear, or Hand; 1 *Cor.* 12.8,9,10,11. with 15,16,17,18,25? And ſhall there be no concord, but a ſtanding mutiny in an Army, becauſe ſome are put up into Quarters, others in Gariſon, ſome to lye in the Fields, others to range abroad in parties, *&c.* In *Acts* 8. 1. we read, *There was a great perſecution at Jeruſalem againſt the Church, and all were ſcattered abroad except the Apoſtles:* And v. 4. *They that were ſcattered abroad, went every where preaching the word.* Here are different Lots, and different employments; ſome perſecuted, ſome ſpared; ſome going abroad to preach at their peril, others ſtaying at *Jeruſalem* in a more fixed way, as *James*

and

and other Brethren did, as is clear by comparing this place with *Acts* 21. 18. yet who finds any discord among them upon this account? Remember, that it is the Magistrates fault, not your Brethrens, that ye are not all equal sharers: Why then do ye let forth your Crab at the Innocent? O look higher than Man in this! Is it not the different dispensation of his Soveraign Providence, who is not countable to us of any of his matters, *Prov.* 29. 26. 1 *Cor.* 12. 18. and may do with his own what he will, *Matth.* 20. 15. may set up one Star to shine, and let another better lye by? Who may say to him what dost thou? Is not this difference of dealing to be stooped unto and adored, and not to be quarrelled? *Tolle quod tuum est, ut vade, Matth.* 20. 13, 14. Submission unto, and Improvement of, your own Lot and Case, and not to dive much into others, is your blessed Duty, *John last. v.* 21, 22. But to say no more, not a few, and these none of the simplest, do judge, if your fierce Divisions and brisk Animosities did not so much serve the bad Designs of some, who bear sway in Affairs (who therefore love to cherish them, by fretting you with exclusion from favours, while others get) belike you might soon have your desire of a general liberty. But your contendings are too good a game (for promoting their ends) to let them die out for want of fewel: O then let not this defectiveness and lameness of the favour, be a bone of Contention any more!

The Sixth Objection is, the manner of their entry unto these Charges, wherein they Officiate, not being called by the people (as is alledged)

nor

nor admitted by the Presbytery, as wont to be, and so they seem not to come in at the door, (in an orderly way) but at the Window, or by a by-way.

Answ. Here indeed, there are strange, but groundless, and unjust outcryes made against them: For evincing whereof, and satisfying the mis-informed, let these following Considerations be pondered.

First, As to the alledged want of the peoples previous Election and Call, we say these things.

1. What needed these Ministers any new Election or Call, who were, by the Indulgence, returned to their own former Charges?

2. As for these who were licensed unto other parts, we affirm, it is a great mistake to say they came without the call and consent of the people: For, in the first Indulgence, Licenses passed not but upon Address first made to the Council for the same, by some in Name of the Parish; and as representing them, which after the License passed, was backed by a second and more ample Call, and most serious Invitation by the Elders, Gentlemen, Masters of Families, and other such most considerable parts of the people, in their own name, and of the rest of the Parish; earnestly beseeching these Indulged Ministers to come and labour among them in the Gospel, till God should open a door for their return to their former Charges: So that they had the Election of the People doubly, both Prior and Posterior, unto the Councils License; and always anterior to their own minting, in the least, to come to the Charges they were Licensed unto. Sic like in the second Indulgence,

albeitt the Magiſtrate waited not upon Peoples Election, but ſupponing all theſe outed Miniſters men of approved qualifications, (being formerly ordained by Presbytery, and in no leſs eminent charges, than he allocated them unto; and alſo much flocked after by people, when they Conventicled:) And thinking his Grant of Licenſe or Act of Toleration, did no more *(ſtricto jure)* depend upon peoples call, than their call doth upon his Toleration; did therefore do his part anteriorly to the Peoples call, (a method indeed, though not ſimply and intrinſecally ſinful, yet full of hazard, and liable to many inconvenients in a conſtitute Church;) yet none of theſe ſo indulged did offer to come to beſtow their labours in theſe Pariſhes, without the Pariſhes call firſt had. Now, what doth it import to the Miniſters, whether the Peoples call did precede or follow the Prince his Civil Licenſe? Or what reaſon hath any to object, if the people was ſatisfied with the Miniſter Licenſed, and did cordially call him? If any think the Prince his Nomination, was a taking upon him the peoples right of Calling, it is a great miſtake; being only a Civil and Legal Licentiating, not an Eccleſiaſtick Calling.

If ye ſay, It prælimited the people in their freedom.

Anſw. Not at all: They were ſtill left to their freedom, as well as when a Presbytery giveth them a Liſt, as often wont to be. Hence ſome people called others, and obtained the Licenſing of them too, and paſſed by ſuch as the Council did nominate for them, as leſs fit for them. However,

ever, if the Prince did in this method prelimit, and incroach upon the peoples freedom; as ye will readily find it an Act of Oppreſſion only, not of Uſurpation; ſo is it his fault alone, but doth not cencern the Miniſter, nor can be any juſt exception againſt him whom the People acquieſced in, and cordially called; and hitherto we have heard of none of them repenting of their choice. Moreover, Suppoſe the Magiſtrate had nominated and elected ſuch and ſuch Miniſters to ſuch and ſuch places (which yet he did not) in this *broken State* of the Church, we deſire to know what wrong were done thereby, more than when your States and Council did nominate and chuſe the Superintendents for ſuch and ſuch Provinces, as your Church alloweth in her ſhattered caſe, in the *firſt Book of Diſcipline*, *p.* 37. Sic like, did not all the Miniſters in the Church of *Scotland*, before the year 1649. enter by Preſentations from the Patrons, without the Election or Call of the People? But was this ever counted a Relevant Objection againſt their Miniſtry, or for ſeparating from them againſt the lawfulneſs of hearing them? Why then are the Indulged mens entry quarrelled as ſinful, and their Miniſtry as defiled, who yet wanted not the peoples full call? Thus ye ſee it is a miſtake, to alledg their want of a due and valid call: And for the quibbles about the method of it, how weak a ground are they to caſt at them, and plead for Separation from them, for the ſame; ſith they militate only againſt the Magiſtrates precipitant or prepoſterous proceeding (if ſo you judg it) but makes nothing againſt the Miniſters, it

being all one to them (as to the validity of their Call) whether the Peoples Election was antecedent or ſubſequent to the Rulers Licenſe: See *Ames. Caſ. Conſc. Lib. 4. Chap. 25. Th.* 29. Yea, Divines tell us, that peoples conſent ſubſequent to a Miniſters entry (though it abſolve him not of diſorderlineſs, yet) doth *ratifie* and make good his right to labour among them as their Paſtor; even as *Leah* (unjuſtly obtruded upon *Jacob*) did by his conſequent conſent become his Wife; and might no more after that be repudiate, than his beloved *Rachel*, whom he choiſed before he married her.

But here, ſome as we underſtand, *Object*, How can Miniſters having another people, to whom they have a prior ſtanding relation, be counted, though elected and called, the Paſtors of theſe people, to whom they are indulged? Can a man have two charges at once? To this we *anſwer*, (1) That they may very well be called, counted, and ſubmitted unto by the indulged people, as their own Miniſters, juſt as your honeſt Miniſters Mr. *Robert Blair*, and Mr. *John Livingſton*, and others, became Paſtors of Churches in *Scotland*, notwithſtanding their relation to their former charges in *Ireland*, from which they were driven away by the violence of the time. And as famous Mr. *Welſh* did take charge of a Congregation in *France*, being baniſhed *Scotland*. And as we ſuppoſe your baniſhed Brethren in *Holland* would not ſcruple to take charges there, if Providence offered the ſame, even as others of your number has accepted of Charges in *Ireland*, and

that

that without the consent of your Church in *Scotland*, and also without your quarreling at them. We wonder why ye impugn those indulged men so briskly, when others of the same practice as to this are allowed. Shall it be counted vice in the one, which is counted virtue in the other?

(2) Not to debate, if when by violence of a time, a Minister is incapacitate to exercise his Ministry among his people, (as your Ministers were *by Law*, and that backed with *force*), and so it became morally impossible to discharge his Office unto them; whether in that case he be *Civiliter mortuus*, dead in Law unto them, and his Ministerial tye and relation, *Divino nutu* loosed, or Providentially broken and dissolved, as *Ames.* asserts in his *Cas. consc. lib.* 4. *cap.* 25. §. 35. We are made to understand that some of these who impugn their Brethren most hotly, are of this opinion, and therefore count not themselves obliged to look after their old Charges, more than after any other. Whereupon we wonder at their calling their Brethren men of Pluralities of Charges, whilst themselves take the whole Church universal for their charge, at least all the Parishes in *Scotland* indefinitely, *& æquo jure*. But let us suppose the relation to stand undissolved *quo ad habitum*, or *jus ad rem*; yet seeing there is a *Supersedeas* put, by the times to the *actual exercise* of it, what hinders but they may and should lawfully bestow their labours in any other part of the Lords Vineyard, being called thereunto, until Providence open a door of regress to their former Charge? In which case, though they be not

simpliciter and absolutely the fixed, stated Pastors of these people, yet are they conditionally, and for that *interim*; and not like meer itinerant and occasional Preachers. Their call determineth them unto, and stateth their relation to these people, until occasion of regress. Nor is it absurd for them to have relation to two different flocks at the same time in a *different manner*, viz. to the one *habitu*, to the other *actu*; or thus, to the one κτησει, or by way of propriety, to the other χρησει, or by way of loan and use for the time.

Next, as to the plea of their not being admitted to these places by the Presbytery, as wont to be. For taking off this, know (1) that they being Ministers already, needed no new Ordination or Mission. As for that solemnity of admission used formerly in Transportations, what is it as to the stating the man Pastor of that people, but a publick solemn Declaration of the peoples consent and subjection unto him? and a solemn Introduction of him into his work? and was materially had by the indulged in the peoples express and full calling of them, and practical subjection to their Ministry: That solemnity therefore of Admission (so called) being at most, and in best times, not *necessary ad esse*, but only *expedient ad bene esse*, that is to say, not essential and absolutely necessary, but only for solemnity and conveniency of stating the relation, (as learned *Voetius* sheweth in his *Desperata causa Papatus*, pag. 263.)

Which they did exhibit, not only *de futuro*, as when they call an expectant; but *de presenti*.

What

What hinders but it may be wanted without any detriment to the relation? like marriage conſummate without ſome of the Rites and Solemnities, ordinary, and fit when they may be had. Can any with reaſon ſay, that Preaching of the Goſpel by actual Ordained Miniſters, invited and earneſtly called thereto by people, dependeth ſo abſolutely and eſſentially upon that punctilio of order; and Subſtance is ſuch an underling to Form, that if this be not (nor poſſible to be had) that ſhould not, may not be in no caſe, no not of much extremity, and urgent neceſſity, as this was? Sure what Divines ſay of Baptiſm, may be applied here, *Non privatio, ſed contemptus damnat*, ſo not the bare want, but the neglect of Admiſſion is a fault and marring defect, being only a point of order, which in ſuch a broken time could not be had. And therefore the want of it derogates nothing from the validity of their intereſt in that people, nor from the lawfulneſs of their labouring among them. And to object it againſt them, ſeems to ſavour more of prejudice than of any real ſcruple.

But (2) remember this was a *broken ſtate* of the Church wherein ordinary Formalities and Solemnities (fit to be obſerved in a *conſtituted* Church) could not be obtained; for, ſeeing there were no Presbyteries in being, who can juſtly quarrel theſe Miniſters for want of the Presbyteries ſolemn concurrence? Namely, if Brethrens conſent and approbation was generally had diſjunctly (as far as there was acceſs to acquaint them with the matter in the ſcattered condition

they were in) either formally and expreſly, or tacitely and in ſome equivalent way. What more could have been done in ſuch an extraordinary caſe? and the extraordinarineſs of the caſe, did it not ſufficiently diſpenſe with, and excuſe the want of that uſual point of Order? which therefore in this caſe is no irregularity and diſorder, *privative.*

(3) It meriteth Conſideration, that the indulged did not come unto theſe Pariſhes like tranſported Miniſters, to fix with them without an eye of return to their former Charges; but only for an *interim*, till acceſs to their old flocks be granted; and conſequently there was no neceſſity of the Solemnities uſual in the admiſſion of tranſported men.

From all this is it not plain, that their manner of entry is not ſo culpable as it is by ſome repreſented to be? and we hope theſe probationers and others who come and Conventicle within the Indulged mens bounds, or in other places, not only without, but perhaps againſt the conſent or due call of the Miniſters or Elders, and people of theſe bounds, let be without any Presbyteries Miſſion, as wont regularly to be, according to the Acts of your General Aſſemblies, will not think it fair and juſt to make uſe of this exception, leſt it fall heavier upon themſelves. Shall it be a right door for the one to enter in at, which is reckoned wrong in the other? or contrary?

The Seventh *Objection* is, The want of a full and free Teſtimony (as is alledged) againſt the In-

Incroachments and Uſurpations made upon the Churches Rights, and Chriſts Prerogative, in and by this Indulgence, and otherwiſe.

Anſ. (1) Sith the Indulgence as accepted by the Brethren, is free of all Eraſtianiſm, or Homologation of the Supremacy, as is already cleared; what are theſe Incroachments where anent the Indulged were concerned to bear witneſs more, than the reſt of you? why then ſingle ye them out, and make them the Butt of this Objection?

(2) We are informed, that at the firſt Indulgence, ſufficient was ſaid by one of their number, in name of himſelf and the reſt, before the Kings Council, to clear that they hold their Miniſtry only of Chriſt, and did not at all allow of, or comply with any jot of Eraſtianiſm. And further, that all of them, both of the firſt and ſecond Indulgence (the moſt part having no immediate acceſs to declare before the Magiſtrate) did at their entry to their ſeveral Charges, publickly declare to their people to the ſame purpoſe. As alſo, that divers of them being convented before the Council in *June*——*Anno*——1673, did expreſs their ſenſe of that Act of Rules then intimated to them, to the ſatisfaction of all ſober and unprejudiced perſons, as the Narrative of their carriage at that time at more length bears. Though it be true, we grant, enough was not ſaid to ſtop the mouths of all Cavillers, whom nothing would ſatisfie, except it had amounted to have produced the effect of Impriſonment, as befell one of them, *&c.* Yet ſure it was more than

any

any others of you did, when ye were Convented before the Council for not repairing to the places of your Confinement, *&c.* Does it not then ſavour of prejudice and partiality to accuſe only the Licenſed Brethren as deficient in a Teſtimony, when no others had done ſo much, let be out-ſtripped them, except it be in a corner amongſome vulgar people ?

Moreover, it is credibly informed, that the indulged upon all competent occaſions, teſtifies againſt the iniquities of the times in their Sermons, as well as others do ; (though not indiſcreetly to irritate, rather than edifie) ; and particularly, they have not been wanting to teſtifie againſt all things contrary to Chriſts Prerogative of being the alone King and Head of his Church ; as their conſtant Hearers can witneſs. Whence it is apparent they are not ſo ſinfully ſilent (as ſome alledg) though they make it not their ordinary Theme as ſome others do. Neither are they involved in any Interpretative compliance, or ſymbolizing with the evils under conſideration, ſo far as a juſt Teſtimony can exonerate them thereof. And moreover they are not wanting to give *Practical Teſtimony* for God againſt the evils of the time, in refuſing all practical conforming thereunto, or compliance therewith ; and is not this more than much *Verbal* Teſtimony ?

Yet (3) becauſe many do force miſconſtructions upon their accepted liberty, and have been ready to take offence that ſo little has been ſaid or done by way of Teſtimony againſt the incroachments of the time, it could have been wiſh-

wiſhed, that (beſides your Nonconformity thereunto, and ſuffering upon that ſcore which the ſober cannot but think a real, material, great, practical Teſtimony of far more importance and ſignificancy than much verbal; as is plain from *Luk.* 21. 12, 13. *Matth.* 10. 17, 18.) We wiſh there had alſo been, or yet were, a formal, ſolemn, expreſs Teſtimony, in ample and diſcreet form, agreed upon, and publiſhed by both the indulged and unindulged Miniſters and people jointly, being jointly concerned therein as a matter of common intereſt, that the world might ſee plainly your mind and harmony in this. And this ye know the Indulged were never refractory unto, more than others; yea, was forward for it; but ye know by whom it was obſtructed, and who did draw back and decline to concur with them, and ſo by deſerting them, diſcouraged them from proceeding in ſo choice a duty. But albeit this general concurrence in a full Teſtimony, ſeems neceſſary for ſundry grave Reaſons, namely for the benefit of poſterity and after-ages; yet ſeeing nothing of this kind is done, yea counted by ſome ſcarce practicable in the Circumſtances ye are in, let all of you join in lamenting the defect; and ſeeing the unindulged are no leſs ſhort in giving the Magiſtrate a true information and juſt repreſentation of the ſinfulneſs of theſe matters, and have ſtood as little up to witneſs and plead for God before the Ruler as the indulged, let both the one ſort and the other, lay their hand on their mouth, and confeſs fainting and failing, and pity and pray for one another.

But

But none to upbraid it to another. However, be it ſuppoſed, the Indulgent were deficient in this point of duty, even beyond others, yet what were that but their perſonal failing, but nothing juſtly to reflect upon their liberty, nor to caſt at their Miniſtry, unleſs ye make every perſonal failing of that conſequence; which were a wild and dangerous principle?

The Eighth *Objection* is taken from their obſerving of their Confinement (as is alledged), yea, their ſetling at all in a fixed Miniſtry, and not rather continuing looſe of all particular charge to ſerve the Church in an indefinite itinerant way, as others do in this time of her need.

As to the matter of their Confinement, we ſay, (1) The Act of Confinement, being not of a Spiritual, but of a Civil nature, like Impriſonment, however unjuſt it be, yet we hope ye will not call it Eraſtianiſm, nor Spiritual Supremacy in the Magiſtrate to impoſe it; nor an Homologation of that Supremacy, if Miniſters ſubmit to it; it being in its kind not *extra forum civile*, or illegal and incompetent; no more nor other Civil puniſhments and preſſures unjuſtly inflicted upon, and ſubmitted unto by the Godly in all Generations. And ſurely, to confine one particular Miniſter, or the whole party, is all of one kind, differing only in *magis & minus*, which varieth not the kind, whatever *Incommoda* or ill conſequents follow upon the one more than on the other, that alſo makes no Intrinſecal difference.

(2) We

(2) We would fain know why ye quarrel your Brethrens ſubmitting unto, and obſerving of their confinement (though exerciſing their Miniſtry in the place, to the edification and ſervice of this poor Church not a little), more than ye quarrel others ſubmitting unto, and obſerving inviolably their Baniſhment from their former Charge, yea and others their Baniſhment from *Scotland*, by which means this Church is wholly deprived of their ſervice?

(3) We hope, ye will not ſay, that it is ſimply and abſolutely unlawful to ſubmit, even to unjuſt confinement, or to obſerve it for any time; for that were both againſt Scripture and Reaſon, and to condemn the Generation of the Righteous, who have ſubmitted to the like, yea to more hard and prejudicial ſufferings. Did not *John* the Apoſtle ſubmit to his Confinement unto *Patmos*? *Rev.* 1. and *Paul* to his at *Rome*, Act. 28. Did not your worthy Mr. *R. Bruce* ſubmit to his Confinement unto *Innerneß*? Others alſo to theirs, in *Kintyre*, *Boot*, *Arran*, *&c*? and Mr. *D. Dickſon*, to his at *Turaff*? Mr. *Rutherford* to his at *Aberden*? when yet their Miniſtry was no leſs needed elſe-where, yea much more than your Brethrens is now. And if any Confinement or other prejudice redound to the *Goſpel*, through the reſtraint laid upon their *perſons*, they being paſſive therein, and only the Magiſtrate active, what guilt lyes at their door, more than if they were impriſoned? are not ſufferers to be held innocent? Is not Confinement (upon their part) a ſad piece of ſuffering? and ſhall they be counted

ſinners

ſinners for ſuffering ? Look on it then henceforth as their affliction, not their ſin.

(4.) Whatever ſinfulneſs might be alledged in ſubmitting unto this ſentence of Confinement *in an abſolute way*, as being obſtructive to ſeveral neceſſary duties that lye upon them, which cannot be followed with a *peremptory* obſervation of Confinement ; yet what doth that ſay againſt a *limited* obſervation thereof, *viz.* in ſo far as may be conſiſtent with neceſſary Duties to the Church and Goſpel, and in as far as they are not called by any duty to break it ? what fault is it to obſerve it, while it doth not compet with any duty? that is, while no duty occurs which cannot be gone about without tranſgreſſing it ? And who of all the indulged did ever ſubmit further unto it ? being ready to diſobſerve it, when ever duty otherwiſe called them ſo to do. Only they love not to trample upon the Magiſtrates Authority, to tranſgreſs without juſt cauſe his hardeſt ſentences. Yet ſo far only, and no further, do they regard ſuch ſentences, as that when the Authority of God interpoſes, diſobliging them to obſerve them, they ſcruple not to ſay with the Apoſtles, *Better obey God than man.*

(5) Seeing the Confinement is a Civil ſentence, though mollified with a liberty of Preaching, queſtionleſs the transferring that Confinement to another place with the ſame liberty, is of the ſame very nature ; and no pure exerciſe of Eccleſiaſtical power and Government ; whence it is evident that it is a great miſtake to ſay, it is a planting and tranſplanting of Miniſters Eccleſiaſtical ;

cal; but a meer civil and local mutation of their Perſonal abode, which only conſequently draws along with it the Exerciſe of their Miniſtry, whereſoever their perſons go; even as if they were tranſlated from one Priſon to another. And who but *Papiſts* will ſay, but Miniſters bodies and perſons are under the Magiſtrates Juriſdiction as other mens? and that it is no Eraſtianiſm at all to diſpoſe of them?

(6) What reaſon is there to ſay this Cantonizing of thoſe places and Miniſters, and confining of the Goſpel, is their ſin? for, albeit it be the Magiſtrates fault to ſhut them up thus into corners, yet who can juſtly lay it to Miniſters charge being ſufferers therein? and albeit they be put under chains and fetters of Corporal confinement, as *Paul* was at *Rome*, and *John* in *Patmos*, yet the word of God is not bound, 2 *Tim.* 2. 9. but may have, and has free courſe, notwithſtanding people not being debarred from coming to them, though they like *Jeremiah* be ſhut up (as it were) in the Court of the Priſon that they cannot go far abroad among people, ſee *Act.* 28. 30, 31. Further know, that Miniſters (as above ſaid) ſubmit no further to their Confinement than may conſiſt with the duties of their calling; ſo that when God calls them to go viſit or Preach to other parts, in that caſe they obſerve it not, nor ſtick to tranſgreſs it, God calling them thereto, as he did *Peter* to go forth out of Priſon, *Act.* 5. 19, 20. when yet *Paul* and *Silas* having the ſame open doors, but not the ſame call to go forth, lay ſtill till Authority put them forth, *Act.* 16. 26, 28, 37.

As

As to all this, that it ſeems a ſtrange conceit, to ſay the Goſpel is quite confined and ſhut up where-ever the perſons of ſo many Miniſters are confined; as if there were no Goſpel to be had in the Land, but from them; no not from the hand of the reſt of Non-Conform Miniſters not comprehended in this confinement.

Next, As to their fixing, and that in this caſe, when there is ſuch paucity of honeſt Miniſters, and the neceſſity of the Church is great, calling for mens labours to be extended throughout all the Land; obſerve,

1. That this Objection militates nothing againſt the uſe-making of the Indulged Liberty, in the general, but only againſt the containing the exerciſe of their Miniſtry within theſe Pariſhes; an Objection common againſt all fixed Miniſters, what way ſoever they enjoy it: And therefore it is wondred at, that the Indulged only ſhould be preſſed with it, and all the out-cry made upon them; when they are not alone in the fault, if a fault it be. How many of the outed Miniſters lye by in corners, leſs extenſive in their uſefulneſs to the Church, than the Indulged? And yet the edge of the Objection is whetted only againſt the Licenſed Brethren: what this favoureth of, we leave to your ſelves to judge.

2. We demand, What is this great neceſſity, ſo much decantated and objected againſt the Indulged's Fixing? What, are there not enow of hands beſides to overtake that work, were they all put to it, and regularly diſpoſed of? Sure, the principal Objectors, however they make clamour of the

neceſſity of deſolate and indigent parts, to caſt *odium* upon fixed Miniſters, yet ſeem they to be able enough of themſelves alone for that work; yea and to ſpare now and then a viſit alſo to Indulged mens bounds, or near their Confines, whither their People may reſort. What neceſſity is there of this? And why do not theſe Objectors go and labour in a more permanent way, in theſe needy places, aud not be ſo oft where there is ſo little need?

3. If the Harveſt be great, and Labourers few; Chriſts Direction is, Pray the Lord of the Harveſt to raiſe up, and thruſt out Labourers into his Vineyard, as in *Matth.* 9. But where doth he adviſe, that till all the Vineyard be cultivated and dreſſed equally well in all its parts, at leaſt provided with Labourers, none ſhould fix to a particular Station or Charge? Do we not know, that in the primitive times there were no leſs neceſſities of the People, and paucity of Miniſters; the Church then being but in her Infancy, and much of the Countrey Pagan? Yet did they not ſettle Paſtors in every Church and every City, as they could have acceſs? As in *Acts* 14. 23. *Tit.* 1. 5. And in the times of your firſt Reformation, was it not your Church her care (though her need was ſevenfold more than now) to ſettle and fix a Miniſtry, by degrees, as it could be attained? Settling, and not unſettling, being ever accounted the greate ſt perfection of the Church.

4. Conſider, That the Indulged, as upon the one hand, they look upon themſelves not as being *Apoſtles*, or *actually* univerſal Miniſters of the

Universal Church (though Ministers of the Church Universal, *habitu & actu primo*;) neither as *Pastors at large*, in the Prelatick way, to take a whole Province for their Charge and Diocy, as the Prelates do; but for ordinary, and statedly, they are Watchmen, to stand at a particular Post; or like Shepherds, to feed a particular flock, of which the Holy Ghost hath made them Overseers, (*Acts* 20. 28.) And consequently, that the charge of all the Churches doth not lye equally upon them; Pastors being, by Office, fixed Stars: And it being proper to the great Luminaries, Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, to have no definite Sphere to move in; so upon the other hand, they do not fix in their Charges in the *Independent* way, as peremptorily tyed and limited to that particular People; but they fix in the good old *Primitive* and *Presbyterian* way, *viz.* ordinarily, and in a stated way, to labour in a particular charge; yet so as they may, and will, upon a sufficient occasion and call, go and Preach any where for a time, for the Church's good. And who can look upon this qualified and scriptural fixing, as a fault?

5. The Indulged (we judg) do exceedingly compassionate the need of other places, so dark and desolate; and are willing to concur to propagate the Gospel in these places, so far as may be competent unto them, *Rom.* 1. 14, 15. But they may perhaps humbly desire to be considered these few things, which seem to plead excuse for their not going so much abroad, as some would have them, who complain of their not doing as others do.

First,

First, Until all the Miniſters out of charge (who have no other work to do) be put to it, to ſupply needy places in a way of watering, at leaſt; and that done, it be apparent, that the work of the Goſpel cannot otherwiſe be carried on, unleſs the Indulged relinquiſh their preſent Station, and go forth and Travel in an Evangeliſtical way to promote it: They think the need of them not ſo very great.

Secondly, It would be conſidered, they are not idle where they are, they are at work in the Lords Vineyard in this Land; (not wholly uſeleſs to this needy Church, as ſome worthy Brethren in exile are) yea and in a peculiar ſort, tyed to labour in theſe places before others; and theſe places needing and deſiring all they can do and more, How then can it be any other, than to Rob *Peter* to pay *Paul*; to put them from their preſent needy people (who think they cannot, without loſs and prejudice, want them almoſt a day) to go and travel among others? And would it not give Miniſters juſt ground of complaining in the words of the Spouſe, *Cant.* 1. 6. *My mothers children were angry with me, and made me keeper of the Vineyards, but mine own Vineyard have I not kept.* Look what advantage ye think their going abroad would do to other places; would it not damnifie their own people as much? And ſhould they rob their own, to ſupply others?

Add to this, Thirdly, That the Indulged Miniſters ſtand in ſuch Circumſtances, that if they adventure, were it but to go for a time, to labour among other people, contrary to the Rulers leave;

ye know what inevitable hazard they are in, not only of perſonal prejudice, as others are, but of loſs of that publick peaceable exerciſe of their *Miniſtry* they now enjoy: A priviledge, which all the good may be done by their excurſions to preach here and there, will not countervail the damage of loſing it; ſpecially, ſith many of the Indulged, were they deprived of their Liberty, and laid by, would be certainly rendred uſeleſs and unſerviceable to the Church, at leaſt much leſs capable; being unable to traverſe up and down, and preach in the Fields, as others do. And what advantage will redound to the Church, by hudling them up again in a corner, who now are ſteadable in their publick Station to whole Country-ſides about them, who reſort to hear them, though they go not forth unto them? Since therefore it is doubted by them, if it be *in majus bonum Eccleſiæ*, for the greater good, and not rather for the greater detriment, of the Church, to adventure upon that which inevitably draweth the ruin of their preſent liberty along with it; who can blame them not to be raſh therein? Namely, conſidering, that if *Hazard* be a ſufficient argument to excuſe the baniſhed Miniſters their not returning to the work, and others their lurking when looked after by the Magiſtrate; certainly it cannot but plead as ſtrongly, and more, for excuſing the Indulged for not going to preach otherwhere; their hazard being more than any's, *viz.* not only Perſonal, but Miniſterial. And further, the people over whom they now are, being particularly intereſſed in them, it ſeems they are not *ſui juris*, *i. e.* not free to diſpoſe

poſe of themſelves to preach where they may (upon all perils, as other Miniſters are) without their Flocks conſent, to whom they owe all they can do, as Miniſters; and whom they may not adventure to rob of their Miniſtry, by expoſing themſelves to the danger of that itinerant preaching, without their leave: Till therefore their peoples conſent be had, pardon them to be ſhy of this matter.

Fourthly, Since this general way of Preaching, which ſome would put them unto, if practiſed by them, would doubtleſly inſer the forfaultry and loſs of their preſent Liberty; and they may Preach their Valedictory to their preſent Charge that day they go forth to the new: We would fain know *who* ſhall *put* them to run this Risk? And *who* ſhall direct them *where* to go unto? or for *how long?* We think ye will not ſay, they ſhould run at random uncalled or unſent. Sure, they need ſuch a Relevant Call and Miſſion as may warrant them to hazard their preſent freedom, and may quiet their Conſcience in caſe of ſuffering the loſs of it, beſides perſonal ſufferings, which may by and attour happen them. Now, what is the call or miſſion they have to that work? Will ye ſay they ſhould go *proprio motu*, of their own heads? What a door might that open to Confuſion? And will that ſatisfie their Conſcience, when it is ſaid to them, as to *Elijah*, *What doſt thou here?*

If ye ſay, they ſhould go to ſatisfie their Prethren, who grudgeth at their tarrying at home, and be diſpoſed of, and ordered by them.

Answ. Who made these Rulers over their Brethren? And were not this to set them up as Prelates and Dictators to their Brethren? And to prostitute their Ministry to gratifie the humors of men, even to sacrifice it to their discontents? Wherein what peace or answer of a good Conscience they would have, namely, if suffering come, we see not.

All which Premises being seriously weighed in the Ballance of Christian Sobriety, who can justly wonder that they stick so closely by their present Stations? Neither need this difference of practise make any Division, no more than the different employments of Soldiers in an Army, allows them to mutiny; some being allocate to stay in Garison, some to lie in the Fields, others to scout forth here and there, as the Prince pleases to order. As the Indulged wishes a blessing upon the Labours of their honest Brethren, who visit needy places; so it were fit those, who, in providence, are loose of all particular charge, would be doing at that general, indefinite, itinerant way of Preaching, unto these needy parts, till God otherwise provide; and not grudge at their Brethren, who are not idle at home, though they be not free to come abroad with them. And, least of all, should people make it an exception against hearing them; to say I will not, should not, hear such a man Preach within his Parish, because I get him not also abroad elsewhere to hear, How ridiculous were that!

If it be *said*, Then what shall be done to supply the needy parts of the Land?

Answ.

Answ. If there be not enow of hands among the Unindulged (who seems lyes neareſt that work, wanting other work) then let an orderly way be taken, by common conſent, to provide for that; and it is not (we judg) to be doubted, but the Indulged will ſubmit unto whatever ſhall, by common counſel and conſent, be determined and laid upon them, as competent unto them, and conſiſtent with their preſent Miniſtry; yea and albeit it tend to undo their preſent Liberty, if it be judged by the Judicatory more for the good of the Goſpel; they are willing to be Ruled by the common advice and determination of Brethren. But to unhinge and caſt themſelves looſe upon no other warrant, than to pleaſe ſome male-contented Spirits, will ye not think it very pardonable in them to forbear it? Specially, while all others not in their condition, are not put to work; who ſeem to be more nearly concerned in that itinerant way of Miniſtry, having no acceſs unto a ſettled Miniſtry, as your Brethren have.

If ye *ſay*, Peoples Neceſſity is Call enough to determine Miniſters to go and Preach to them.

Answ. 1. Then muſt ye go to the *Indies* rather than ſtay in *Scotland*; and to the *Highlands*, rather than *Lowlands* of *Scotland*, becauſe the neceſſity there is greater, yea and acceſs alſo, if ye will but try it.

2. Neceſſity alone is only Relevant to determine idle men, or Freemen, that are at their own diſpoſal; ſuch as the Indulged are not, being tyed to particular charges, as others are not. Should they commit Injuſtice, in robbing other Churches

of their Labours, (whose debtors they are in a special way) to the intent they may charitably relieve the necessities of others? Ought not Justice to preponderate to works of *Charity*?

Now Ninthly and Lastly, It is *Objected*, That this Indulged Liberty is, and could not but be, of direful consequence and effects; and the Indulged in accepting it, have done more ill than all the Bishops and Curates in *Scotland*: What an unhappy, unhallowed Hemlock must it then be? Not a plant of Gods planting?

Answ. Pitiful it is, what a deal of *Hue* and *Cry* is here set against honest men by virulent passion! We are astonished at such rage and raving! why, what are these bad effects the acceptance of their liberty doth natively produce? Ye *say*, more ill have they done thereby to the Church, than all the Prelates and their Party. Were this true, why then has the Prelates and their Friends such an antipathy against it? Do not all know it was granted over their Bellies, and sore against their Mind? It is their eye-sore as it is yours; and to this day never did they like it, except in so far as ye made it an Apple of Contention among your selves, and thereby diverted your edge of them. Did not many of them say, it was the high way to break, undermine, and wear out their Government? Thinking that as *Dagon* could not stand before the Ark, neither Prelacy beside any little of Presbytery, without losing ground daily? Did they not exclaim against it as a reviving, perpetuating, and rivetting the Presbyterian Interest, which they thought had been quite broken and buried?

bvried? Sure they have other thoughts of it, than you.

Again, What one point of the received Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government of the Church of *Scotland*, has your Brethren, by their Indulgence receded from? whilst the Prelatick party have overturned the whole Fabrick of her Governmen t, and bears down all that joyn not issues with them therein? Does your Brethren persecute you as they do? do they not rather plead for you, excuse your extravagancies; protect and shelter and feed you, so far as they can? Or is the pure and free Preaching of the Gospel by them, any harm to the Church? Is the restoring of so much of an honest Ministry to the free exercise of their Ministry, a Nail of the Lords Interest, in the Holy Place, such an intollerable evil? The Prelates indeed count it no small evil, and are you and they in so far agreed? But while ye charge them so heavily, what if they should retort and tell you, that as Hereticks destroy the *Fundamentalia Doctrinæ*; so do Schismaticks and Dividers, *Fundamentalia Ecclesiæ*, by dissolving the Compages of Christs Mystical Body into so many fractions; and that a Mutiny in an Army is no less destructive, than Treachery; and cutting and wounding of a mans body, may be no less fatal to his life, than stripping him of his Cloaths and Ornaments, yea or some grains of poison.

But because *Dolus versatur in Generalibus*, we pray you condescend upon the evils particularly, which their acceptance of this Liberty hath done: And because *Si accusasse satis esset, quis erit innocens*, we

we pray you prove what ye assert and alledge upon them. If ye strike upon the old string of their setting up Erastianism, homologating the Supremacy, *&c.* that is refuted, and they vindicated therefrom already. But there are three Instances further, we hear somewhat of.

1. *Say* ye, By this means the rest of their Brethren are exposed to suffering, who are not free to accept that liberty, or are secluded from it; did all stick together, it might be more safe.

Answ. Here is strange Policy, instead of sound Divinity: What trouble cometh on any for refusing or not getting a share in the Liberty? On this score who are put to suffering? What accession then hath Brethrens acceptance, to the trouble of the Refusers? If trouble befal them upon other accounts, what is that to the Indulgence? Or, would the Indulged, their refusal of their Liberty, lenified the Magistrates offence, and protected all the rest from suffering? or rather irritated him more, and drawn on suffering on themselves with others? Who will say, those of the Children of the Captivity, who returned to *Jerusalem*, when Liberty was granted, did expose the rest who stayed still, or were detained in *Babylon*, to further bondage and suffering? Will ye not be pleased if suffering befal you, unless all drink of that same Cup; albeit in Providence they be not called unto it? Must your Brethren tarry and take part with you, merely for company-sake, and let the Lords work, to which they have a call and free access, stand? and refuse a lawful Liberty of a necessary duty, only because others are not pleased, or not partakers?

kers? But, as we think they wrong the Indulged who look upon them as altogether free of ſuffering, ſeeing their very Liberty is annexed to Confinement; ſo we bleſs God to ſee the Generality of other Miniſters as yet meeting with ſo eaſie a meaſure; and ſome of thoſe that make the greateſt noiſe of complaint, enjoying their own accommodations (God ſo providing) every way comparable, if not preferable, to theſe ſo much magnifyed, falling to the ſhare of the Indulged. But in fine, while ye ſpeak of their expoſing you to the Magiſtrates diſpleaſure by their acceptance of the favour, think how ye can clear your ſelves of expoſing your Brethren to the Peoples obloquy and fury, by your non-acceptance.

2. Some *ſay*, It tends to ſhut up the Goſpel in a corner, and to harden the Magiſtrate in his Eraſtian Incroachments.

Anſw. As for the former of theſe, it is taken off already in anſwer to the Eighth Objection: Sure their confinement is a grievance, an affliction, but not their ſin: If the Magiſtrate, who has power over their perſons, do ſhut them up not only in one Province, but in one Pariſh, yea in one Priſon; and if they ſubmit and yield their bodies to the power of the Magiſtrate, what fault in all this can be charged upon them, who are merely ſufferers in the caſe? And as for the alledged hardning the Magiſtrate; unleſs ye prove that their acceptance of the Liberty is either in it ſelf ſinful, or at leaſt but indifferent, and no ways neceſſary; what doth your *Hypotheſis* and arguing reprove? Muſt duty be deſerted becauſe any ſtumble on it?

But

But beſides, your *Hypotheſis*, we humbly ſuppoſe, is groundleſs, and merely alledged by you, who pick quarrels at, and ſtrain all Topicks to ſugillat their foreſaid acceptance: Sure it hath no native tendency to ſuch an effect. But ſee if your refuſing to accept, do not harden the Magiſtrate in his hard thoughts of you, and of the perſwaſion ye own, and in the ſevere reſolutions and courſes uſed, or may be uſed, toward you and the Cauſe.

3. Some do criminate the accepted Liberty, as a μηλὸν ἐρίδος, has occaſioned much Diviſion and Difference, and is much diſliked by many godly; and therefore cannot be ſonſy, but ſome woful, unhappy thing.

Anſw. This was briefly cleared before in anſwer to the fourth Objection; and therefore we ſhall now ſay no more to it, but theſe five things.

1. That there are as many, and far more, godly, not againſt it, as are againſt it: Is it not too Phariſaical a Cenſure, to monopolize the Title and Reputation of Godlineſs to you and your party that be againſt it, and to condemn all as ungodly and backſlidden that are for it? Good Information ſays, the generality of the grave, judicious, ſerious, and ſober godly, are not againſt it, as it is accepted by your Brethren; yea and that fewer are for dividing and renting from their Brethren upon that ſcore. It is by good hands ſaid, there are not above ten or twelve Miniſters, and but few alſo of the old Chriſtians, in all the Land, againſt the liberty as it is accepted, but only againſt the Complex of the Buſineſs, which the

the Indulged are not for either, as was cleared in ſtating of the Queſtion: Neither are there many of theſe Ten or Twelve for making it a ground of Diviſion or Separation.

The only perſons that be *ſimpliciter* againſt it, and for dividing, (ſo far as we can learn) are a very few, and thoſe moſtly of the younger inconſiderater ſort, both of Preachers and Profeſſors.

(2) As for difference of practice, that needs no more breed diviſion or animoſity, nor *Jephtha's* was a juſt ground of *Ephraims* quarrel, *Judg.* 12. 1, 2, 3. Or theſe Diſciples was for the reſt their ſnarling at it, in *Luk.* 9. 49, 50. When ſome of the Children of *Judah* returned to *Jeruſalem* upon *Cyrus* his Proclamation, and others ſtayed ſtill, or were ſome way detain'd in *Babylon*, what ground of diviſion or out-caſt was this? or ſhould difference of lots divide your hearts and affections? See what was ſaid to this before in anſwer to the fifth Objection. And further, ſuffer us to tell you, that as when the generality of Non-conform Miniſters were ejected, ſome were in Providence overlooked and ſpared, and that without the envious eye or grudg of heart of thoſe who were thruſt out; ſo we wonder how this difference of lots when ſome are favoured with liberty, others not, ſhould make any breach among ſober men.

Is not God to be eyed and ſtooped unto in this, and to be waited on by faith and patience till it be otherwiſe?

(3) Do

(3) Do we not find our Lord Jesus himself, his Gospel, and Gracious Miracles, sometimes a stone of stumbling, and rock of offence, matter of division to many visible professors of Religion? as *Luk.* 2. 34, 35. *Joh.* 9. 16. *Joh.* 10.19,20,21. *Mat.* 10. 34, 35, 36. *Luk.* 12. 49, 51, 52, 53. *Joh.* 7. 40, 41, 42, 43. *Act.* 13. 45. *Act.* 28. 22, 24, 25. But who will therefore say, they were not of God, but unhappy things being the matter of such disturbances, obloquy and contradiction, every where spoken against, and occasioning sad consequents? they that *take* offence, when no just ground of offence is *given*, let them see to it, the blame lyes at their own door, *Mat.* 15. 12, 13. Suffer us to say, like as Christ said of himself, *Mat.* 11. 6. Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended at a thing so innocent, so necessary as this permitted liberty (in so far as it is accepted) is.

(4) Sith, as was said before, your Brethrens acceptance of that liberty is in it self a guiltless practice, then sure, however it be an *occasion*, yet can it be no culpable *cause* of division. The only cause (that should bear the blame) is mens mistakes and corruptions, whereof even professors are not free. These are the wedges of Division which actively rents you asunder.*

(5) We are made to understand that any of the truly serious Godly their being against this matter, is through want of *right Information*, yea some's industrious practising upon, and daubing them with most *injurious representations* of the state of the matter, and *odious calumnies* of their Brethren,

thren, done on purpoſe to draw honeſt people away after them, *Act.* 20. 30. Who (almoſt) of all theſe good people underſtand the Controverſie or true ſtate of the Queſtion, but are led not by light, but prejudices, and byaſſed affection? Are they not made to believe that the Indulged have cloſed with all the whole Complex of the Magiſtrates Acts forementioned, and have Homologated the Spiritual Supremacy, and joined iſſues with Eraſtian Incroachments, and other ſuch like falſe and foul alledgances, whereof the Brethren are free, as is above cleared? How have we oft been aſhamed upon your behalfs, to find in your writings, private diſcourſes, and publick Sermons, your greateſt Topick, and *Achillean* Arguments to be Reproaches, and groundleſs Accuſations of your Brethren? and theſe born in upon people as Divine Oracles, and certain Truths? Thus good people have been and are abuſed by ſome *Ardelio's*, who make it their work to infuſe into their minds prejudices at the Brethren, as guilty of a defection, and then to work upon their miſinformed zeal, to turn their edg againſt the Brethren? How many can atteſt theſe undeniable Verities? whence it is evident how much honeſt peoples caſe is to be pitied and lamented, as hugely abuſed and impoſed upon for ſtrengthening of a party, and making up a faction, the tendency whereof is not ſeen by well-meaning people, who are led like *Abſaloms* followers in the ſimplicity of their hearts. And had not the indulged Brethren been too ſilent for peace-ſake, to ſpeak for themſelves,

ex-

expecting that God and Time would have cleared people of their miſtakes and miſapprehenſions, much of all this miſleading of people into ſuch rancors and rage, might have been happily prevented by a full and true ſtating and vindicating of their practice. And if this mean Eſſay of ours do contribute clearing unto any one, even the leaſt of Saints, and ſhall provoke ſome of theſe Brethren to do ſuch a neceſſary work better and more fully, being better able for it, we ſhall not repent our adventure, but bleſs the Father of Lights for it, *Jam.* 5. 19, 20.

Now, Dear Friends, all theſe things conſidered, how little ground ſeems there to be for making ſo great a ſtir, as ye do? as if the *All* of Religion lay at the ſtake in all this matter, and theſe honeſt men had made the vileſt defection! Whereas lay aſide prejudice, byaſs, and perſonal ſlanders, and let any weigh their cauſe in an even Ballance, the Ballance of the Sanctuary, they will be found in it not ſo black by far, as ſome take them to be. Be intreated therefore in the Lord to hearken to that warning, *Act.* 10. 15. *What God hath cleanſed, that call not ye common or unclean.* We hope ye will tremble to be found perverters of the right ways of the Lord. Call not light darkneſs, no more than darkneſs light. Is not as well he that condemneth the juſt, as he that juſtifieth the wicked, an abomination to the Lord? *Prov.* 17. 15.

And ſuppoſe all that is ſaid, do not meet with, nor fully clear every ſcruple (it being hard to ſatisfie where prejudice is great; and a quibling wit

wit may ſtart more Objections than we have heard of, or has leiſure to ſpeak unto), yet conceive by what is ſaid (though weakly), more charitable thoughts of your Brethren, and of what they have done; and let them not ſtand condemned with you under ſo groſs a character as hitherto; *Rom.* 14. 3, 4. 1 *Cor.*. 10. 30. But unite in the Lord, notwithſtanding your Differences, the Grounds thereof being ſo inconſiderable as hath been ſeen.

We doubt not but themſelves could, and would, give you a more convincing vindication, were not their averſation even from ſeeming to contend, and their hopes that their Integrity will defend it ſelf, makes them loth to enter the liſts. However our ardent deſire to beget a good underſtanding between you, has thus far carried us forth unto, not an Eriſtick debate, but a ſerious diſquiſition for diſcovery and removal of miſtakes.

To return then to our propoſed courſe of Advices.

Advice 6. In the ſixth place, let us lay this before you, That however your judgment ſtand in the matter contraverted (for we are to impoſe upon no bodies judgment, but to leave every one to their own light), yet ye who are againſt the Indulgence, as accepted, and fomenters of the Diviſion, conſider, though ye be but few, yet the ſtir ye make is great, and one man will eaſily raiſe more fire than twenty will be able to extin-

guiſh. Therefore be *exhorted in the fear of God to carry the difference more ſoberly.* Are your Brethren willing to let you enjoy your judgments, and ſerve your light in your own practice? and to live in peace with you, notwithſtanding the difference? And as to things wherein ye and they are agreed to join with you therein, till God in his time clear up the miſtake that is betwixt you, and ſhew upon whoſe ſide it is? and will not ye be content, unleſs ye impoſe your apprehenſions upon them, and have them conform unto, and lackey after your opinion and practice? muſt your judgment be the Standard and Canon to every bodies elſe? and all be Anathematized that differ in the leaſt from you? Can there be no peace with you, unleſs ye have leave to trail them at your heels? will ye agree with none that are not of your mind in every thing? then *Actum eſt de pace*, peace is gone for ever on this ſide of time; for, *Non datur intellectus Averroiſticus*, mens minds to jump to an Ace in all things is hardly to be expected. While we know only in part, will there not be perpetually different meaſures of light? and diverſity of Apprehenſions in many things? Theology having its own Problems, even in greater points than this, which calleth for ſobriety and mutual Tolerance.

As we are not for Scepticiſm, nor ſinful Syncretiſms; ſo we tremble at the vanity of Dogmatizing in things of this nature. But whatever ye deem it, Treat not your Brethren undiſcreetly. Speak or write *to* them, rather than *of* them. Argue the caſe with them, convince them if ye can,

Luk.

Luk. 19. 17. But uſurp not a Magiſtery over them; preſume not to be Dictators to them more, than ye would take it well they ſhould impoſe on you, *Jam.* 3. 1. Remember they muſt ſerve their own Conſciences, and be guided by their own light, and not yours, *Rom.* 14. 12. Ye think them wrong, ſo do they, no doubt, you: But how would ye take it, if they ſerved you as ye do them, with outrageous out-crys, virulent Epiſtles, and *Philippick* Declamations? What if they did Preach againſt you, your Diviſive Principles, and unbrotherly practices, as Erroneous and Donatiſtical (if not worſe), as ye call theirs Eraſtian? What a pitiful taking would ye and they be in by ſuch Contradictions and Invectives? Do therefore no otherwiſe than ye would be done unto, *Mat.* 7. 12. Think ye are but men fallible, and may be miſtaken in not a few of your confident notions; and that it is poſſible they may have as much of the mind of Chriſt as you. Therefore reverence their Judgments, ſo far at leaſt as not lightly to trample upon the ſame: Or, if ye were ſure they were in the wrong, yet think, ſurely they mind honeſtly (as they judg ye do) and *have not wickedly departed from the Lord*, Pſal. 18. 21. If they be ſtept aſide, it is but for want of light, which ye (who think ye ſee more) ſhould pity and bemoan to God, and labour to diſcover their miſtake unto them, (for as yet ye cannot charge them with contumacy, ſufficient conviction never being yet held forth unto them.)

But, O! reproach them not; rate them not behind their backs; go not to Preach them down,

nor out of the hearts of honeſt people, much leſs to Preach their own people from them! What ſervice were that to Chriſt, or his Kingdom? or what edification unto people? Sure ye do more hurt than ye are aware of by this courſe, ſtaggering and unſetling people, weakening your honeſt Brethrens hands in the Goſpel, and marring the ſucceſs of their labours what ye can. See *Jam.* 3. 16. *Gal.* 5. 14, 15. But what? are not ye and they agreed in chiefeſt Principles and Theſes? What's your difference then but about the application of Principles to ſome Hypotheſes or particular caſes and practices? The Intricacy whereof, with the ſenſe of your ſhort-ſightedneſs, may teach you to think, ſpeak, and act more ſoberly, and with all due reſpect to them that differ from you.

O fall not into a ſtated Schiſm upon ſo ſmall and diſputable a matter! nor lift up your ſelves in conceit above your fellows! Are ye Preachers of Chriſt? ſo are they: Have ye the ſeal of your labours, ſo have they; and that they have not more, is perhaps through your fault, your contending with them, thereby confounding and diſtracting their people; and taking them off their ſouls eaſe, by your perplexing controverſies and exceptions againſt their Miniſters. And if ye continue by this contending, to diſcourage your Brethren, and enervate the work of God in their hands, fear leſt ye be found guilty of deſtroying ſo much of the Kingdom of Jeſus Chriſt, and countable for the blood of theſe ſouls whoſe edification ye mar, by abuſing and amuſing them with

with your bartering at their Miniſters, and bringing them and their Preaching into diſeſteem, ſo far as ye can, as *Zach.* 13. 7. *Smite the ſhepherd, and the ſheep ſhall be ſcattered.* And what have ye gained when this is done? What advantage is it to the Goſpel, to break ſo many faithful mens Miniſtry? And what peace will it yield you when accompliſhed? *Bella geri placuit, nullos habitura triumphos.* It were but a *Cadmean* victory. What! may ſtill the old queſtion be put unto you, *Does your piety and zeal lye all in Negatives?* (as theirs in *Col.* 2. 21.) Are ye only skilful to deſtroy? and bold to treat the friends of Chriſt like foes? Preach the Goſpel, and propagate real Godlineſs as much as ye can: but O! beware of hurting the Lords work and vineyard in your Brethrens hands! Will it not be but a poor vaſſalage to preach down your Brethren, while ye ſhould preach up Chriſt? and to propagate your private opinions more than the power of Piety? or to draw Diſciples after you more than after Chriſt? Were it not better make one real Chriſtian, then proſelyte twenty to your ſide and party? Ye complain of your Brethrens want of ſucceſs, as *Peninnah* upbraided *Hannah* with her barrenneſs; but do not ye much mar their fruitfulneſs? O be tender of them, for the Goſpel's ſake! Go, we pray you, convert the prophane to Piety, rather than preach Profeſſors into faction and parties. Mind the great intereſt of the Goſpel more than your particular debates, or perſonal intereſts. Away with ſelfiſh deſigns under a ſpiritual mask! Beware of giving ground for

that old complaint, *Faciunt cauſam ſuam, cauſam publicam.* Let not not your excellent parts, fervor, zeal and ſpitits, be ſpent upon ſo unprofitable a task, as this of jangling, plunging, and confounding is. And tempt not people to any unhappy courſes, which your ſelves may repent of in the end, and come off with that inconſiderate Warriours word in your mouth, *Non putarum*—— It is eaſie to kindle a fire, but not ſo eaſie to ſet bounds unto it, when and where ye liſt, ſaying, Hitherto ſhalt thou come, but no further. Nay, once kindled, it may rage whither ſoever the winds and aptneſs of the matter to take with it, may carry it, till all be burned down to aſhes.— And finally, let not your Brethren have cauſe to take up that ſad regrate of the Pſalmiſts, *Pſal.* 55. 12, 13, 14. *Had it been an enemy, &c.* How bitter is this? Were it Rampant *Romaniſts*, or Inimical Prelatiſts, or foul mouth'd Sectaries, who thus battered at honeſt Miniſters, it were more tolerable? But to ſee Brethren at ſuch odds, tearing the fleſh (as it were) off the bones of their Brethren, by bitter railings and reproaches, (which are as drawn ſwords, *Pſal.* 57. 4.) how incongruous and unkindly is that? and may not the world wonder at it? What! ſhall all your edg and ſting be turned againſt them, no leſs upright than your ſelves? Shall they have no ſuch Adverſaries as you whom they love and deſire to be at peace with? and with whom they agree in all things (almoſt) elſe? Will ye do the Prelates work for them, in breaking that little liberty which at firſt they trembled at, till they ſaw you

you made it a bone of contention? and ſo more likely to break your ſelves and it both, than to hurt them, while ye ſtumble ſo upon it. What thanks will ye get for joining iſſues with them? See *Obad.* v. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. And will ye ſo poſitively condemn your Brethren unheard, (*Joh.* 7. 51.) and perſecute them as Apoſtates, before ever ye wair an admonition on them? It is our admiration and aſtoniſhment, that ſome of you (as is informed) takes the confidence to baffle them in Sermons, Letters, and private Diſcourſes to the people and others; and yet to this day never uſed the brotherlineſs to write or ſpeak unto themſelves, what might have ſufficed to convince them of their error, if any be. The groſſeſt of Hereticks are not allowed by the rules of the word to be ſo hardly dealt with, *Tit.* 3. 10. Pronounce no *Anathema* upon them, till ye firſt take pains ſufficient to reclaim them, and find them obſtinate. Shall ye be ſharper ſcourges in their ſides, and thorns in their eyes, than any others? Do ye like it, to put them to cry to God againſt you, and (like *Job*) to complain of their friends mockage, injuſtice, and cruel uſage? Shall not God viſit for theſe things? *Zeph.* 2. 8. *Obad.* v. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. Beware of inventing, or venting Stories and Reproaches of ſuch friends of Chriſt! And make not calumnies the ſtrongeſt Arguments you plead againſt them with. Monopolize not the reputation of honeſty to your ſelves; give your Brethren charity, and treat them not diſreſpectively. To ſtigmatize your Brethren with black Characters, and odious Im-

putations, consider again and again what spirit it cometh from, *Jam.* 3. 9, 10, 11, 12.

Upon all these Grounds, and many more which might be added, be intreated (in the bowels of Christ) to remit and relent of your Acrid fervor, and bring your dispositions and differences to some temper, and manage your discord with more sobriety. We think we may say, the two part of your differences lyes more in the Acrimony of your spirits and alienation of affection, than in the distance of your Principles. Would ye let go the misunderstanding and prejudices that are between you, and God heal your dispositions and distempers, the two part of your Disease were away.

Advice 7. Ye who are Indulged, a word next to you: *O bear with your Brethrens differing from you; and judg charitably of them, as to the most part at least.* Construct it want of light, not sinistrousnes of intention or affection. He that keepeth a day, keepeth it to the Lord; and he that keepeth it not to the Lord, he keepeth it not. In Problematick questions not defined by the Church, allow others a latitude, and continue your brotherly forbearance. If even with Infidels and Hereticks the servant of the Lord must not strive, but be gentle, *&c.* (as 2 *Tim.* 2. 24, 25.) how much less with sick and feverish Brethren? If any mans inconsiderate and opinionative zeal carry them unto any unbrotherly word or deed toward you, be not ye overcome of their evil, but overcome their evil with your good. Pack up

their

their Reproachings, and ſay, *Father, forgive them, they know not what they are doing.* Let not their vexing you fret you into a wearying of your work, (*Pſal.* 55. 6, 7, 8.) nor unto any diſaffection or leſſening of your reſpect unto them. Love them as Brethren, notwithſtanding all injuries (as *Joſeph* did his), and honour their zeal in the Lord, and pray he may channel it right, and ſet its bounds; for ſo it might do him excellent ſervice.

Tolerate alſo good peoples Infirmities; let none of their capricious humours (which theſe reeling times tempts them unto) diminiſh your tender care of them. Seek that which ſtrayeth, heal the diſeaſed, and by gentle dealing convince them that ye walk in the Spirit of Jeſus, whom ye ſerve.

Hard things (we confeſs) are cut out for you; but put on patience and holy reſolution, ſtand your ground notwithſtanding all Batteries, and do your work over the belly of all diſcouragements, (*Heb.* 12. 2, 3.) What though ye be the Witneſſes Propheſying in Sackcloth, (*Rev.* 11. 3.) your Crown will be the maſſier.

Serve the Lord through good report, and ill report, honour and diſhonour; and make full proof of your Miniſtry, which is thought ſo conſiderable by Satan, elſe he would not oppugn and oppoſe it ſo, upon the right hand and the left. You are the eye-ſore of the Prelates and their party, and the Butt of thoſe your Brethrens miſtaken zeal. Be ſtrong therefore in the Lord, *&c.* Our ſoul pities you, being as the ſpeckled Bird among

among the Birds of the field, laid at upon all hands, and grinded as betwixt two Mill-ſtones, *viz.* the Prelatick parties enmity upon the one hand, and the fierceneſs of theſe male-contented friends upon the other, (and *who may ſtand before envy?* Prov. 27. 4.) But learn of your Maſter to endure Contradiction, and to be ſet for a ſign to be ſpoken againſt, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed, (*Luk.* 2. 34, 35.) Endure the Croſs, and deſpiſe the ſhame. Wounds in the houſe of Friends as well as of foes, muſt be born till he ariſe and plead your cauſe, and bring forth your Righteouſneſs as the light, *&c.* This is the day of your trial, and theſe are the Inſtruments choſen of the Lord for that end; acquit your ſelves like men, like Chriſtians, like Miniſters in it. Bear the indignation of the Lord patiently, becauſe perhaps ye have ſinned. If *Shimei* rail, he may be a good Monitor, though a bad Judg.

Take your vexations as ſo many whetſtones, to keep you in an holy edg, that ye blunt not in theſe up-ſitting times; and as ſpurs in your ſides, to prick you up to diligence in duty; and ſo may you get meat out of the eater, *&c.* Stoop to your lot, there may be a bleſſing in it, (2 *Sam.* 16. 10, 11, 12.) But bitter though your life and labour be, yet faint not, O faint not! but approve your ſelves to God and man in your Maſters ſervice; and by piety, painfulneſs and powerfulneſs in the Goſpel, convince gain-ſayers, ſtop the mouths of thoſe that ſpeak evil of you falſly, and Preach home again all the reſpect and affection

ction which theſe times of difference has derogated from you. What? have ye not the ſeal of your Miniſtry (a witneſs of Gods approbation) upon the hearts of many? even of ſome who perhaps are now alienated from you, who once ſpake of a bleſſedneſs in your Miniſtry, and received you as Angels, though now in the hour of tentation, they are become as an enemy? *Gal.* 4. 15, 16.

Though Converſion of Sinners be not ſo frequent (and yet ſome there is) yet has not God been evidently with you for Confirmation and building up of the Saints, and for Conviction upon all, who, whether they be better of you or not, yet are forced to ſay, God is in you and with you, and a Prophet hath been among them? as *Ezek.* 2. 4,5. Now, may not theſe eminent Divine Aſſiſtances, Succeſſes, and Proofs of acceptance, abundantly compenſe all your tears, ſufferings, and ſorrows? and anſwer the queſtioning of your being ſent of God, being proofs of Chriſt ſpeaking in you? Conſider, the priviledge of your liberty, and think, is not ſervice to God and his people (which hereby ye get done) well worth the enduring much contradiction, obloquy and heart-breaking reproach?

Remember alſo your Brethrens ſufferings are ſad at other hands, though none at yours; and let your ſympathizing with them ſweeten your own at their hands.

And Oh! be ſtirred up to make good uſe of your Liberty which coſts you ſo dear. Let your people find through Gods help, that it has been

their

their mercy, that ever ye were ſent among them; or whether they hear or forbear, that there has been a Prophet among them. Keep in good terms with your Maſter, ſtand in his counſel, know the Times, and tell what of the Night, and what *Iſrael* ought to do; be faithful in all his houſe as ſervants; and good Stewards of the Myſteries of God.

Bear burden with your Brethren in their tedious ſufferings conſtantly. And pray for a bleſſing upon their Preaching of the Goſpel, albeit ſome of them would ruin yours: And whoſoever of them may preach Chriſt out of contention, or faſt for ſtrife and debate, ſuppoſing to add affliction to your griefs, and to detract from your eſteem, yet rejoice ye that Chriſt is Preached, and that ſincerely by the moſt, *Phil.* 1. 15, 16, 17, 18.

Eighthly, Both of you, *Take heed ye bring not your differences any more unto publick, nor otherwiſe put them among the people:* Keep them amongſt your ſelves, where they may abide with leſs hurt, *Rom.* 14. 1; 22. Conſidering the miſchiefs of evulgating them, it will evidently appear happy to bury them in ſilence or oblivion. If ye intereſs and engage the people therein, then are ye gone; and beſide other inconvenients thereof, ye ſhall not get leave to unite again without their conſent, which may be hard to gain. How long ſhall any affect popularity, and thereby ſubject their Miniſterial Authority to the humours of men and women, for drawing them to their ſide, to ſtreng-

ſtrengthen their party? by which means people are taught to domineer over Miniſters, and may fore-run you, and caſt at your ſelves next, when ye begin to ſit up and not go along with all their notions and inclinations. Ye may perhaps find no ſmall difficulty to regulate and bridle their humours, being once aloft, *Fertur equis auriga, nec audit currus habenas.*

Moreover, what do ye by filling peoples heads with ſuch intangling controverſies, but divert their minds, and take them off the main thing? and turn Religion into factions and debates? and wear them out of heart-tenderneſs, real exerciſe of Conſcience, and the ſerious ſtudy of univerſal Holineſs? If any make it their work to kindle in Religious Hearers, a factious, opinionative zeal, you may thereby trouble their heads, not better their hearts; and may ſooner make them fire-brands to burn down the peace, purity, and order of the Church, than living poliſhed ſtones for the New Jeruſalem. Yea, likely you may unhinge them ſo, as to tempt them to caſt at all Miniſters, at all Religion, and turn either Atheiſts, or Seekers, and Sectarians, as woful experience hath many times proved, even in our own days; ſo ſmall a friend to the promoting of piety, is diviſion.

Avoid then carefully to diſcover your inteſtine jars and animoſities before the people in publick or private. Bear not your nakedneſs to their eyes.——Teach them not to meddle with things above their ſphere, and beyond their line, (*Pſal.* 131. 1, 2.) and turn them not aſide unto vain

vain janglings, *Tit.*3.9. 2 *Tim.*2.17,18. 1 *Tim.* 1. 6, 7. & 4.7. & 6.4,5. Make it rather your work to edifie them in the Subſtantials of Religion,and Vitals of Piety, ſuch as Faith, and Repentance, Humility, Sobriety, Mortification, Self-denial, Love and new Obedience, *&c.* How much better were it to fire their hearts with the love of God and man,than to heat their heads with puzling debates, which do but perplex, not edifie, and are far out of the way of their Salvation or Duty, and doth not at all concern their practice. What profit reap they by being inveigled into ſuch quick-ſands? we have ſeen many unfleeced of their wool, yea torn in their fleſh, by being involved in ſuch thorns, but never any advantaged?

Ninthly, *Study Moderation in all things:* Let not Chriſtian prudence paſs with you for wiſdom of the fleſh, nor Chriſtian Moderation for *Laodicean* lukewarmneſs. *Let your moderation be known to all men*; let it be viſible and apparent, both in your paſſions, opinions, and diſcourſes.

1*ſt.* Moderate your *Affections*, let not wild-fire take the place of zeal, nor zeal turn paſſionate, pickiſh, peeviſh and bitter. What is πικροζηλία, but κακοζηλία? Nor does the wrath of man work the Righteouſneſs of God.

2*ly.* Be moderate in your *Opinions:* This Moral Idol of the mind (*Opinion*) is too apt to be adored, and overſway. Put a temper to it, and hang a Ballance upon it, to keep it in poiſe and courſe; for true is that in common experience, though

though a fallacy indeed, that *Opinio eſt veritate major.* And for Moderation in Opinion, ſtudy well,

(1) Your *Fallibility* and aptneſs to miſtake, and conſequently to dwell in a conſtant ſelf-jealouſie and ſuſpicion. We like not to allow of fluctuating and Pyrronian doubting about neceſſary and vital points, nor to hang all opinions either (like *Mahomets* Tomb between the two Loadſtones) in an *æquilibrio.* Yet too much confidence in matters of meer opinion is oft a vanity, refuted ſufficiently by the new diſcoveries time and induſtry produces, compelling us to alter. But what one thing does contribute more to beget and continue ruptures, than conceit and Idolizing of ſelf-wiſdom, and ſelf-opinion, with an undervaluing of all that differ from us, while yet (perhaps) they may hit nearer the mark of truth than we, and have better advantages to diſcover it than we ?

(2) Study *ſelf-reflection,* to conſider how oft ye have found in time your (once confident) opinions to have failed you, that you have been neceſſitate to change and take up new Meaſures. And this will help you to much moderation, experience being the Schoolmaſter of very fools.

(3) Be moderate in your *Diſcourſe*; how are ſome's tongues dipt in gall, and ſet on fire of Hell! and inſtead of edifying Communication that may miniſter grace to the hearers, little other than rigid cenſuring, and bitter back-biting of one another! O when ſhall our tongue be our glory, not our ſhame! but to bridle the intemperancy

of

of the tongue, ſtudy to ſpeak nothing but what God may hear, and as in his hearing; ſpeak of others as of your ſelves; and this will make you ſpeak ſparingly, charitably, and with due moderation. And were tongues once well governed, and that unruly evil tamed, no doubt but differences would ſoon diminiſh. *Let your moderation then in all things be known to all men, the Lord is at hand.* Moderaion in our way, is like the ſymmetry in the humours of the body, which keeps all in health and happineſs.

Tenthly, *Seeing ye are generally reputed the beſt of Miniſters, let both of you prove your ſelves to be ſuch indeed, by ſhining in the exerciſe of real goodneſs, and of a lively Miniſtry, as ye have acceſs to it.* Let not the world be miſtaken of you. They judg you pious, painful, ſober, grave, learned, judicious, and truly zealous for God, making his Statutes (not humour nor intereſt) the men of your counſel, and rule of your actings. They take you for excellent heart-warming Preachers, *&c.* O deceive not their good opinion and expectation of you. Let them have a proof that ye may be ill wanted from the work of the Lord, and that it is no ſmall loſs to the Church for you to be laid by, and creep into corners.

Take not meer Non-conformity for Religion enough, nor honeſt-heartedneſs for a ground to juſtifie miſcarriages, or to excuſe weakneſſes, much leſs for Canonizing all your practices and opinions as Sacred, as if ye were infallible becauſe honeſt. It is believed there are not ſo many able

able and godly Miniſters and Chriſtians in any party, proportionally to your number. Yet if any of you be found weak, raw, unſtudied Divines, will it not reflect upon all, and blemiſh the party? Be not ſatisfied then with the applauſe of thoſe that follow you, who may in their charity commend you, while others, impartial or inimical, may obſerve cenſurable weakneſſes. O ſtudy hard, read and pray much, that you may be found Champions for God, and accompliſhed Divines, 1 *Tim.* 4. 15, 16. O that ſome of your Novices, Itinerants eſpecially, would take more pains in ſtudy, that they might be well furniſhed Scribes, *&c.* and not be raſh, to bring forth crude, undigeſted Preachings or Reſolutions of Caſes of Conſcience. It grieveth ſouls to get (at any time) empty, unedifying Harrangues of Railing or Reflections, inſtead of ſoul-feeding Sermons or Diſcourſes. Beware of a Ga'd of venting your paſſions, rancour, bitterneſs, under pretext of Preaching againſt the ſins of the time. Subtle are the tentations of Sin and Satan!

Eleventhly, *Exerciſe your ſelves unto ſtedfaſtneſs, and repentance:* Be men of Principles, and underſtand your Principles, and ſtand to them, *Rev.* 3. 3. Quit not eaſily good old Principles for any plauſible new ones. Hold faſt by the Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline and Government of the Church of *Scotland*, to which ye are ſo ſolemnly and ſtrictly tyed. And let not new intereſts ſtart new Principles, nor put you out of the good old way. Take the Law and the Teſtimony for your only ſupreme Judg of Controverſies, Rule of Faith, and Direc-

ctory of Duty. Cleave to the Lord with full purpose of heart; and be not soon shaken in your minds with any blast of tentation, nor bewitched with any Novelty, (*Gal.*3.1,*&c.*) Keep your Garments clean in all Revolutions; and change not Articles of your Creed and Duty, with change of times, as most of Conformists do. *Ecebolius's* (or Weather-cocks) are hateful to the Lord, *Jer.*2.11. It becometh honest men to be no time-servers, or fickle Changelings, 1 *Cor.* 16. 13. *&* 15. 58. *Col.* 1.22,23. 2. 5, 6, 7. Add to this fixedness, the exercise of *Repentance.* Be sharp upon your own, even severer against your own faults, than against any others. Witness against the publick ills of the time, as ye have access in your station; but neglect not your own iniquities, for which God is contending so hotly. For what cause is his Controversie pleaded so long against you, but for the provocations of Sons and Daughters, and the iniquities of your holy things? Is there no accursed thing among you, which makes you fall before the Adversary? Blame not one another, but rather each suspect himself, saying, *Is it I? Is it I?* Every one of you, no doubt, hath laid to your coal to make up this great indignation. Therefore let every one be mourning as the Doves of the Valleys, each one for his own iniquity (persons and families apart) as well as keeping publick Fasts for the Abominations of the Land. What a Token for good would this be? and would put you in case to sigh and cry, and wrestle with God for the Nations sins. And were ye thus lying in the dust before the Lord for your selves and *Zion*,

and

and running with your Censer in your hand, between the living and the dead, for Atonement, crying, *Spare, O Lord, &c.* we doubt not but your heats and animosities among your selves would soon cool and calm.

Twelfthly, *Guide wisely and tenderly honest people, yet so as still to keep your own place; to be their Guides, and not let them guide you.* Cherish their good, bear with their infirmities; but humour them not in their conceits and follies. Let never Popularity be your snare. Spare not to admonish and rebuke with discretion and authority, when need is. Take pains as well to inform their Consciences rightly, as to raise their affections keenly. Study prudently to cross and cure what may be healed, and patiently to endure what cannot be cured. But clap no persons heads in their mistakes, or irregularities, for fear ye lose them if ye cross them; else ye may be made to lose them upon a worse account, with an ill conscience to boot. Despise not the counsel or admonition of any, *Job* 31. 13.) Yet if you permit them to turn Dictators and Leaders to you, your well-days and peace are gone, (*Prov.* 29. 21.) *Luther* said, there is a Pope in every mans belly; ye may find a Bishop in every man and womans breast; each inclineth to think themselves infallible, and would be a Lawgiver unto others, and cannot endure others not to conform to their mind in every thing: Which usurping disposition in people would be checked. Be sure if once ye give up your selves to serve humours, as it will put you out of Service to God, *Gal.* 1. 10. so will your servitude be a sort of Egyptian bondage; and if ye sing not to every tune of theirs, the

upshot will be as bad, as if ye had never gratified them at all. O be tender of their Consciences, and wisely regulate their humours, not by servile compliance, but by happy conviction, or canny diversion. Austerity and fondness are (almost) equally dangerous. And that ye may manage them rightly, not only seek Gods good guiding, but also be denied to their applause, and dead to their censure. The sober and wise will approve you, when perhaps the peevish or proud kick at you. But it is enough if wisdom be justified of her children.

Thirteenthly, *Live daily in the prospect of further sufferings, and therefore unite so far as ye can*; lest the enemy finding you in a divided distracted condition, prey easily upon you. Doubtless your trial is not at an end. The furnace is heating sevenfold more. Think not at every respite the bitterness of death is over, and the worst is past; and so begin to pluck up your Crist, and wax wanton and secure; if ye do, it says a new storm is near, 1 *Thes.* 5. 3. *Psal.* 30. 6, 7. The Prelatick violence is indeed sad enough; but what in comparison of the Papistick, which is at your door? And is dividing, biting, and devouring one another, fit providing for such a storm? Were it not more your wisdom and happiness to be hearkening to the Apostles Rule, *Phil.* 3. 15, 16. to be composing rather than heightening differences; and wherein ye agree, uniting, and forbearing one another in points of difference, till the Lord decide the Controversie? otherwise the enemy may perhaps decide it with the broad sword. Will ye be like *Archimedes*, who while he was busie at his Mathematical Lines, the Enemy entered the Town, and killed him at his Skeams? Or like the Zealots in *Jerusalem*, who

who while they waſted one another within the Walls, *Veſpaſian* and his Army are ready without to invade and deſtroy both? Shall it be that *Dum aguntur partes, perit Saguntum?* How weak are ye, and a ready prey to every beaſt of the field that pleaſeth to devour, while thus disjointed and ſeparate! *Vis unita, fortior.* If ever ye mind to ſtand effectually to the maintenance of the Goſpel, unite in time, it will be too late when the *Papiſt* is got upon your back.

Fourteenthly, *Notwithſtanding the ſeverity of thoſe in Authority, unto you, be not ye tempted to ſlight duty unto them.* Let not their commanding unlawful things diminiſh your readineſs of obedience in things lawful. Remember they are the Ordinance of God, and reverence them accordingly, (*Rom.* 13. 1, 2, 4.) Pray for them, (1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2, 3, 4.) Elſe if ye caſt them out of your prayers, God may juſtly leave them to be a ſadder ſcourge unto you; and ye may have little peace of Conſcience there-under, conſidering how little ye wreſtle with God upon their behalf, that he would guide them right. Ye might perhaps rule your Kings heart, Counſels and Courſes, were ye *Nehemiah*-like, or *Ezra*-like, high in Court with God, and plying the Throne of Grace hard for him. Be admoniſhed withal not to ſpeak evil of Dignities, (*Exod.* 22. 28. *Act.* 23. 5.) Deſpiſe not Dominions, (*Jud.* v. 8.) However they miſcarry, lament ye that to God, yet ſpeak not diſreſpectively of them. Bear all due reverence to them, for the Lords ſake, as the fifth Command obligeth; and while they gall you, do not ye fret your ſelves to any reciprocal exorbitancy. Let not ſharp ſufferings canker and imbitter you. Learn to be ſubject and

reſpective, not only to the good and gentle, but to the bad and afflictive, 1 *Pet.* 2. 13, 14, 15. Obey none of their unlawful commands, yet ſubmit (not uncheerfully) moleſting of you, bearing the Croſs patiently, meekly, contentedly, 1 *Pet.* 2. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23. And who knows what mollifying influence upon the heart of Rulers, your meekneſs in ſuffering might have? ſee *Prov.* 25. 15. *Eccleſ.* 10. 4. However, we are perſwaded in the Lord, your patient Chriſtian bearing of hardeſt things, will adorn the Goſpel, and in end be victory to your *cauſe*, come of *perſons* and *particular intereſts* what will, ſee *Revel.* 12. 11. *Rom.* 8. 36, 37. Often has the Church and Truth of God conquered more by ſufferings, than by acts. *Sanguis Martyrum, ſemen Eccleſiæ. Creſcit ſub pondere virtus.* But beyond many other things, beware of wronging your Conſcience and Cauſe by being tempted by your ſufferings to take up either ill Principles, or ill practices againſt the Magiſtrate. Let none dare to think, as we hear ſome one or two begins to muſſitate, that the Magiſtrates miſcarriages about the matters of Religion, does forfault him of his right to govern, and ſo *cadens titulo*, is no more to be owned as King. A principle which all ſound *Presbyterians* abominate, as witneſs your Confeſſion of Faith, *cap.* 23. §. 4. Sure none but *Papizantes*, or *Novaturientes*, will own ſuch unwarrantable Principles. O let no ſeverities byaſs your judgment unto error, nor tempt you to put forth your hand to iniquity; if any unhappy one or other, by ſo doing, bring an *odium* upon an honeſt cauſe and party, whoſe ſoul hateth to eſpouſe ſuch things, they have much to anſwer to God for. And no leſs injuſtice will it be for any to lay the dotages of one or

two bearing your name, to the charge of the whole. We heartily wish in so far as may be without sin, (and farther we desire it not), that Friends of Reformation (as you pretend highly to be) would instead of irritating, stretch themselves to insinuate upon the Magistrate; and to set what value they lawfully may upon any thing of favour from him. Whatever the Rulers have done, or are, (for which ye are to beg repentance and remission, and reformation to them), nevertheless they are the Ordinance of God to be submitted unto, tendered and respected for Conscience-sake. And though we are not to set limits to the Soveraign Grace, Wisdom and Power of God, who can deliver his people and interests *when* and by *what means* he pleases; yet we are sure ye are in the way of your duty, when ye look to God for deliverance by their means, by the returning of Judgment to Righteousness; being sensible that if he take not that method readily, he will plead both with Rulers and people, which will rather increase spiritual Plagues than diminish them. And in order to this, it is your duty and wisdom not to foster the Magistrates jealousie that Christs interests cannot rise but to their prejudice, which (it is feared) hath no small influence upon them; but rather by all your deportment, to convince them, that they do well consist together, and that the promoting of Christs interest, and shewing favour to the friends thereof, is the security and stability of the Throne. Dear Brethren! we doubt not but all these counsels are your study and care, yet pardon us to stir your pure minds, and let that of 2 *Pet.* 1. 12, 13. be Apology for our presumption. And hoping God writeth his Laws in your hearts, and after the hour and

power of darkneſs is over, will recover you from your diſtempers, we ſhall therefore ſupercede to ſay any more, a word to wiſe men being enough.

Only in the laſt place we would ſpeak a word or two to you the good people, who adhers to the Truth, and labours to keep your Garments clean of the publick pollutions. Verily, your reſolution, courage, conſtancy, and zeal for God, your affection to the purity and power of Ordinances, your reſpect to an honeſt Miniſtry, *&c.* are moſt commendable; your adventuring to ſuffer hardeſt things, rather than ſtain your integrity in the meaneſt point; your taking joyfully the ſpoiling of your Goods, and tedious Impriſonments, exile from your Native land, and other ſeverities, and all for the ſake of Chriſt; is no ſmall document of much good in you. Pity it were ſuch a choice Generation of forward Chriſtians were not always rightly acted, or did in any thing ſtumble. Yet alaſs! who that looks with an impartial eye, may not ſee ſeveral things to be lamented in you? To meet with, and amend which, ſuffer us, dear friends, to propoſe a few counſels unto you, in like manner. We hope ye ſhall not find them diſſonant from the mind of Chriſt, nor find cauſe to refuſe to follow them, as cauſing to err.

Firſt of all, *Let not all your Religion conſiſt in publick matters.* Make ſure your perſonal intereſt in God; neglect not your own Vineyard, your own ſouls caſe; and werr not out of Heart-exerciſe, and ſelf-judging, *&c.* while ye are ſo much taken up about the publick; but let Perſonal Godlineſs be happily joined with publick-mindedneſs; elſe your ſelves may be caſt-aways, after ye have done and ſuffered

ſuffered much for the name of Chriſt, 1 *Cor.* 9. *ult.* 1 *Cor.* 13. 2, 3. Particularly, let never your publick ſufferings, or the Righteouſneſs of your Cauſe (as to man) hide from you your Perſonal failings and guiltineſſes before God. Neither pride your ſelf in being ſtrict and tender in publick matters, and mean time lax enough in your Perſonal Walk and Moral Duties. Will ye not hear a Conformiſt? and yet make no conſcience of lying, ſlandering your Neighbour? *&c.* will ye run after Preaching? and yet make little conſcience to practiſe what ye hear? O place not the ſum of your Religion in publick things, though true it be, they are much to be regarded. Beware alſo of ſpending your time and ſpirits in debates, and vain janglings one with another, to be tentations one to another, raiſing your own and others paſſions and corruptions, inſtead of holy Conference that might miniſter Grace to the Hearers. Mind well the Apoſtles Caveats in 1 *Tim.* 1. 4, 5, 6, 7. *&* 5. 13. *&* 6. 3, 4, 5. 2 *Tim.* 2. 16, 17. 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 11. Is it not obſervable, that the greateſt ſticklers in differences, the greateſt diſputers and contenders are uſually the moſt diſtempered and barren hearted? like the mountains of *Gilboa*, high and hot indeed, but dry and unfruitful; warm, but withered; the unkindly, fooliſh, heat of diviſion and debate, eating out the life, ſap, and native heat of real Religion, which evaniſheth then into airy notions and litigious ſtrivings, whereof no edification cometh. O let not Religion fly up from your hearts to your heads, and evaporate into airy foams and forms, and turn vappid and inſipid. Be ſure by Queſtions and Diſputes, as well the power of Religion is enervate, as the Majeſty of it infringed. The many

Diſ-

Disputes about Religion, commonly overthrows the practice of it, which consisteth not in Discourses, but in doing. It is easie for a Formal, moth-eaten Christian to hold up in the one, while he cannot bear up in the other, as *Seneca* observed anent Moral Virtue, *Omnes disputare malunt, quam vivere*, more prone are people to debate about the things of God, than to practise what is uncontroverted. If Heaven could be obtained, and God pleased with jangling and debates, a prophane Sophister should sooner have the one, and do the other, than a holy Christian, who knows that it is not talking of, but walking in the ways of Gods Commandments, that is most acceptable in his sight. But to say no more, listen to the Apostles Oracle in 1 *Cor.* 11. 16. *If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor the Churches of God.* Love perverse disputings who will, (which ever *corrupteth the mind*), flee ye them as death, 1 *Tim.* 6. 5.

II. *See, that while ye resist one evil, ye run not upon another*; and that fleeing one extremity, ye fall not upon another: Is it not preposterous to be hot against Prelacy and Erastianism, (sad ills indeed!) and yet friendly enough toward Schism, Error, and some other things repugnant to the Word of God, and your Covenants, as well as these? Let your zeal be universal and impartial against all evil, hating every false way; and while ye shun *Scylla*, dash not upon *Charybdis*.

III. *Meddle not with every Controversie that falls in among your worthy Teachers.* Many a Litigation may fall in among them, wherein ye are no further concern'd, than to sympathize and bewail. Mourn for contestings, but do not interess your selves therein,

to

to engage with them; nor dip in disputable points too nice and high for your heads, and nothing edifying for your hearts; much less foment the differences by factious siding, tale-bearing, or otherways begetting misunderstandings betwixt them, *Prov.*26. 20,22. rather carry water to quench the flame, than blow at the spark. He or She that intermedleth beyond their Sphere, will find it a snare, *Prov.*26. 17. And they that sow discord, or blow the Bellows, and stir up strife and alienation, will find it no blessed employment, *Prov.*6. 14,15,16,19. whereas to the Counsellors of Peace is joy, *Matth.*5.9.

IV. *Usurp never to be Teachers of your Teachers, or Guides of Guides.* Take not, like *Corah* and his company, too much upon you, albeit ye are not to follow any man blindly in matters of Religion, but humbly and seriously to examine all things (like the noble *Bereans*) and hold fast that which is good, 1 *Thess.* 5. yet your Teachers ye are to reverence and humbly learn from them, *Heb.* 13. 7, 17. and have them so far in regard, as not rashly to oppone your judgment to theirs, much less to dictate and prescribe unto them, and not let them have your peace, unless they follow all your opinions. What intolerable Arrogance is it, for weak heads of Men or Women (whom God has set to learn, not to teach) to leave the place of Disciples, and presume unto the Chair, to teach and give Laws unto their Governors and Guides? Has he not said, *Mal.* 2. 7. *The Priests Lips shall preserve knowledg, and men should seek the Law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts?* But where hath he said that Ministers are to be tutored and led by the people? Is it not an high degree of pride, for persons of your Station and understanding

ing, to arrogate to your ſelves to be wiſer and judi-
ciouſer than your beſt Miniſters, who make it their
daily work to read, meditate, and pray; to ſtand
in the Lords Counſel, and learn his Mind, and like
Watchmen ſtand on their Watch-tower to know what
of the Night? With whom is this *Urim* and *Thummim*
more than with his holy ones? If ye find them fail in
any thing, admoniſh them gravely and diſcreetly:
Tell *Archippus* your thoughts humbly and ſeriouſly,
yet preſume not to impoſe your apprehenſions on
him, nor to cenſure him ſhrewdly, if he do not forth-
with become of your opinion; for ye are fallible,
and may be in the miſtake. *Brethren* (ſays *James*,
chap. 3. *v.* 1.) *be not many Maſters.* This Spirit ſavours
little of ſober-mindedneſs or ſelf acquaintance; ſuffer
us to tell you, that as for your ſincerity, zeal, and
affectionateneſs, many of you are your Teachers
joy, and that it is not a little they have done and ſuf-
fered for your ſakes, and their Bowels yern to have
more and more of Chriſt formed in you; ſo for un-
skilfulneſs in the word of Righteouſneſs, for being
ſuch Babes in knowledge, and inability to ſcan in-
tricacies and diſcern between things that differ, not
a few of you are their ſhame and grief; and yet will
ye be their Leaders? Ye know, it is the blindeſt who
uſually are the boldeſt and moſt confident, *Prov.*
14. 16. Be not therefore high-minded, but fear, and
be ſelf-jealous: The holy Ghoſts rule is, *Be ſwift to*
hear, *ſlow to ſpeak*, *ſlow to wrath*, *James* 1. Think
they do but flatter you, who would puff you up with
ſelf-conceit, as if it were people who keep Miniſters
right, and not Miniſters the people, and would teach
you to uſurp over your Leaders.

V. *How much ſoever conſtant Adherers to the Truth*
ye

ye ſhould be, yet be not therein turbulent and unruly; elſe that may be to your profeſſion a bane, and to your cauſe, as the dead Fly: Wherein ye differ from your Paſtors, or from one another, carry it humbly and ſoberly, with meekneſs of wiſdom; and be not ſeditious, untractable, or too peremptory. Shall your Miniſters be put (like *Moſes*, *Numb.* 11. *v.* 10, 11, 14, 15.) to ſigh over you, and groan under you, and complain to God for your tickliſhneſs, frowardneſs, and ſtiff-neckedneſs? And that your reeling is like to undo all? Be not a ſnare and tentation to your Miniſters, but an encouragement and ſtrengthning of their hands. Be neither too facil, nor yet like the untamed Heifer; be neither coldrife, like *Laodicea*, nor drive furiouſly like *Jehu*. Stupid dulneſs and unconcernedneſs (upon the one hand) and frothy light farraudneſs and frazineſs (upon the other) are both to be ſhun'd; and deſtroy not the true intereſt of the Goſpel by either, while ye pretend to be the great pillars of its ſupport.

VI. *Take the Law and the Teſtimony for your alone Oracle in all things*, *Iſa.* 8. 20. Set not up your own imaginations, nor yet take any mans bare aſſertion, for the Supreme Judg of Controverſies, or rule of right, and directory of your way. Liſten to Miniſters, and be not lightly ſuſpicious of their Judgment, but take nothing upon truſt; but ſee with your own eyes, as they *Acts* 17. 11. well ſaid, *Ambroſe*, *de fide ad Gratian. lib.* 1. *cap.* 4. *Noli argumento credas Imperatoꝛ & noſtræ diſputationi: Scripturas interrogemus, interrogemus Apoſtolos, interrogemus ipſum Chriſtum.* Prove all things by the Word, and if any, were he an Angel from heaven, ſpeak not according thereunto, think there is no light in them.

Let

Let nothing that wants a Scripture-warrant, pass currant with you, nor condemn nothing which the Oracles of God condemneth not: Take never the visions of your own heart, nor the dictates of them, for your Bible. Gods word alone, and not Mans, αὐτὸς λόγος, is the unerring Rule of Faith and Duty, *Rom.* 3. 4. Stick therefore close by it in all things, without declining to the right hand or the left, *Deut.* 5. *ult.* If any thing be brought unto, and pressed upon you, without a real *Thus saith the Lord*, receive it not, 2 *Thess.* 1, 2. Tremble to give an ear unto, or to be swayed by sophistical and unscriptural Reasonings about any matter; hold fast by the sure word of Prophecy, and be safe, 2 *Pet.* 19.

If ye state your selves into parties, as the *Corinthians* did, how will ye avoid being puffed up *for* one *against* another? And what one says, be taken as an Oracle, and what another says, cryed down according to Interest and Affection? *Cum res transit in affectum, perit judicium.* Beware of a wrong Byas upon your affection, for that will byas and bribe your judgment, and forbear rash judgings and spurning at Ministers, 1 *Cor.* 4. 5. Censure only what the Scripture censureth, and approve only what it approves; else ye may soon take Light for Darkness, *&c.*

VII. *Cleave close to your Reformed Religion and covenanted Duties, against defections on all hands.* Consent never by word, write, or deed, to any thing contrary thereunto, specially what is expressly and plainly renounced thereby: Yet take heed of captious glosses, and sinistrous applications of your Covenant: It may be wrested, as some do the Scriptures; always stick to its true intent and native meaning faithfully;

faithfully; and resolve to follow the Lamb whithersoever he goes, through thick and thin; and be rather arming your selves for suffering, than contending in the very fire. A common Prison, or burning at one Stake together, may perhaps be made to agree you (as it did *Ridley* and *Hooper*) who would not in your liberty accord, and serve the Lord with one consent, without a jar, as was your duty to have done.

VIII. *Next to Fidelity towards God, study to adorn your Cause with Loyalty to your King, in the Lord*, Rom. 13. 1, 5. Prov. 24. 21. 1 Pet. 2. 13. *Give unto God the things which are Gods, and unto Cesar the things which are Cesars*; that hereby ye may stop the mouths of them that falsly speak evil of the *Presbyterian* Interest and Party, as inimical to Kings Crowns, 1 *Pet.* 2. 15. Did he not in the Usurpers time find you the most faithful party to him of any? And albeit ye be but ill Requat, yet discourage not to follow your duty for the Lords sake. We are apt to believe, if any other party in the Nation had been so crushed and harassed by his Power as ye, none would have born it better. Let him still find that no discouragement will fret or tempt you from your duty, and that for conscience-sake, without by-ends; yea, bear due Allegiance to him, so far as may stand with your Allegiance to the King of kings, and Lord of lords. And who knows what a conviction this may produce in end? 1 *Sam.* 24. 17, 18. testifying to him and all men, your Cause is of God, which leads you to be so conscientious toward man; and that you are the only fast and faithful friends to Authority, who will cleave to it in a stormy day, out of the fear of God, when all its self-seeking friends,

friends will desert it, when their Interest parts with it; and that it is not humour, but conscience, which keeps you off from complying with his will in the matters of your God, wherein ye differ from him.

IX. *Spend more time in praying together about what is amiss in the Publick, than in empty talking about it*, Jer. 50. 4. Remember you have somewhat else ado, than to be idle News-mongers. Go spread ay your sad matters before the Lord, as good *Nehemiah* and *Hezekiah* did; Table all your complaints in Heaven. This would be both a present ease to your mind, and the compendious way to a blessed Remedy. How much sooner might ye get a good account of matters, if ye did put them more in Gods hand, who has the Balm of *Gilead* for such sores? And it would sweeten your spirits and carriage thereunder. Bleed with *Zion* in all her bleedings. Do not laugh while she sighs; nor yet look idly on, and only talk; but be her careful Remembrancers before the Throne; especially let the divisions of *Reuben* breed great thoughts of heart. Let your Pastors differences (which are your great judgment and skaith) be your sorrow, and lye *heavy, heavy*, upon your spirits. They who bear them lightly, or rejoice in them, what a deserted and distempered frame must they be in? But would ye oftner meet and pray about these lamentable matters, who knows but ye might pray away your Ministers differences, and cement your own hearts in greater Christian union, by uniting and concentring in God? And might pray home the Ark out of Captivity, and get the Lord to arise and build *Zion* as in the days of old!

X. *Be not easily tempted to cast at your Ministers, of whose heart-honesty you have had sufficient demonstration.* If once Satan get you to begin a little to spurn at them, he will not cease tempting, and Providence may justly let snares be rained on you, occasions of stumbling be afforded you, till ye turn quite off, and become wild. Notorious it is, that peoples idolizing, inamouredness with some, and rooted prejudice at others, upon partialities and by-respects, are both a cause, foment, and consequent of woful divisions, 1 *Cor.* 1. 11, 12. and 3. 3, 4. O esteem your Pastors highly in love for their works sake, and let not every petty difference cast you and them out: Keep not distance with them, but go and lovingly confer with them anent what ye and they differ in: And if ye get not satisfaction, recommend the matter to God, but let Love and Peace stand intire notwithstanding. What is Satans great Engine, and consequently his design for marring your good of Ministers; but by stating prejudices in your minds at them? Shut your ears and hearts then to all charms that would suggest ill thoughts of your honest Ministers, Receive not lightly ill reports of them, spread perhaps industriously to make them odious, (*Jer.* 20. 10.) to alienate you from them, as *Gal.* 4. 15, 16. Be not then too credulous, try e're ye trust, and admit no bad impressions of them, before ye have found that truly they deserve.

To add no more, In the XI and last place, *Carefully avoid the Sin of Separation, as well as Conformity, so called.* Is not Schism one of your abjured ills, and contrary to the Word of God, as well as Prelacy? O run not upon the one rock, while ye shun the other: Guard well against complyance with the Pre-

lacy, and all Eraſtianiſm too, (which ye ſee by what is ſaid, your Miniſters are free of) but ſtand no leſs at diſtanee from dividing and ſeparating, either from Communion with your Miniſters, or with the Congregations whereof ye are ſtated Members. We hope we need not inſiſt to convince you of the evil of Schiſm, what a ſinful, and what an hurtful ill it is! Nor *when*, and *in what caſes* it is that Separation is unlawful. Read precious Mr. *Rhetorfoord* his Piece againſt the Separatiſts, entituled, *Peaceable Plea*, *Chap.* 10. Alſo the eminently, godly, and Learned Mr. *Durham*, in his *Commentary* upon the *Revelation*, *Ch.* 2. *Pag.* 172, 173. and his Treatiſe of *Scandal*, *part* 4. *chap.* 7 nor dare we think ye will contemn to peruſe alſo ſome of the Engliſh Presbyterian Writers upon Schiſm, who treat thereof judiciouſly, and with tenderneſs; ſuch as learned *Cartwright*, holy *Hilderſham*, pious Mr. *Bayn*; but namely Mr. *Bradſhaw* his Book of the *Unreaſonableneſs of Separation*; and Mr. *Ball* his *Tryal of the Grounds tending to Separation*: As alſo Mr. *Hales Tractate of Schiſm*, *Brinſley* his *Arraignment of Schiſm*, and Mr. *Baxter* in his *Chriſtian Directory*, *part* 3. *cap.* 8. Theſe and ſuch others will inform you, in what caſes Separation is unlawful, how unwarrantable and weak many pleas for Separation are, (and yet perhaps more plauſible and ſtronger-like than yours) and what is the lamentable miſchief of it. Read them carefully, and ponder what of the mind of Chriſt they hold forth, and ſee it no *Presbyterian*, but a *Browniſtical*, and *Independent* Principle, to be either for rigid or moderater Separation, where Communion may be kept without either natural or moral Bars in the way, as there are none ſuch in your caſe. Referring you therefore to ſuch Writings, we ſhall ſay the leſs, only this

this to the case in hand, that if any of you, through instability or seduction, be tempted to separate from, and shake off, your Indulged Ministers, so as merely upon account of their Indulged Liberty, you shall refuse to hear them, or communicate in the Sacraments and other Ordinances of God dispensed by them; specially if your separation be *usual* and *ordinary*, *total*, and perhaps also out of *contempt*; and withal not only *Negative*, statedly withdrawing your self from them, but also *positive*, erecting *altare contra altare*, setting up in distinct and opposite societies by your selves, tempting others also perhaps to desert them, and that both by word and deed; we dare be bold to affirm before the Lord, and intreat you to believe it, that it will be your grievous sin, your fearful judgment, and a woful sign.

1. It will be your *Sin*, being a voluntary, groundless, unjust, rash Separation; in regard you are not *fugati*, but *fugitivi*; not driven away by any violent or sinful conditions of Communion imposed upon you, (as your Fathers were when they separated from the Church of *Rome*) but run away of your own accord, and that without any Relevant Cause, which may hold weight in the Ballance of the Sanctuary; for joyning with them in Church-Communion, is neither upon sinful terms (there being none at all required of you) neither of it self doth it involve you in any sin, their Ministry being lawful, valid, and without stain (as hath been before evinced.) What spot, we pray you, can you prove to be in their Office, or its exercise, which may prove it unclean to you, or justifie your withdrawing and casting at them? The usual Alledgances are confuted and wiped off before, and we take no pleasure *eandem cram-*

ben ſæpius recoquere & reponere, as ſome of yours, *ad nauſeam uſque*, do. Conſider what is ſaid to the nine Objections, and ye'll find the moſt material exceptions taken off, and both their office, their inveſtiture with it, and their acceſs to the exerciſe of it, juſtified and fairly acquit from all Homologation of Eraſtianiſm, or the ſinful Supremacy, *&c.* But beſide, ſuppoſe there were ſome petty *Defects* or *Irregularities* in their entry to the exerciſe of their Miniſtry (which yet appeareth not from any reaſons which hitherto we have ſeen) yet ye ſhould know, it is not every *lighter fault* of that nature, which will warrant Separation; but only ſuch *attrocious crimes* as either *deſtroys* the Eſſence of the Miniſtry, and makes it null and void (as your Reverend Mr. *Browne* teacheth in the Preface to his Book againſt *Wolrogen*, and excellent Mr. *Bowels* in his *Paſtor Evangelicus*, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 4.) for *recte fieri* is one thing, and *ratum eſſe* is another, and *multa impediunt Matrimonium contrahendum*, *quæ non dirimunt contractum*;) or elſe does ſo *vitiate* their Miniſtry, as people cannot joyn therewith in its Miniſterial acts without real and native participating in the ſin, in Gods account, and in the conſtruction of his holy Law: Otherwiſe if there be any pollution adherent to their Miniſtry, which neither evacuates the eſſence thereof, nor ſo intrinſecally leproſieth it, but ye may communicate in its Acts abſtractly from and without touching the ſpot; the ſin reſteth on the Men themſelves, and ye are not concerned therein farther than to lament it, but not to be skared and debarred by it from joyning in their Miniſterial Adminiſtrations, they being to you clean, whatever they be to the men themſelves.

Now

Now plain and ſure it is, neither of theſe evils has place in the caſe in hand; nor can ye inſtruct the contrary. Your bare alledgance or apprehenſion of Homologation, acceſſion, *&c.* will not ſerve the turn here. Therefore ſince ye may communicate with them without ſin, it will be ſin in you to ſeparate. O ſhake not off theſe lightſome Guides whom God has ſet up and over you, by the warrantable Inſtrumentality or means of men. Leave it to the adverſary to caſt down theſe bleſſed ſtars; let the *Philiſtines* ſtop thoſe Wells God has opened for you; but make not ye it your work. Forſake not lightly the Shepherds Tents, leſt ye meet with the Wolf in your wandering. If theſe Miniſters ſhould cauſeleſly, or for trivial or tolerable faults, Excommunicate you, would ye not judg it their ſin? and can ye be innocent, when as groundleſly, or for frivolous reaſons ye caſt them off, and in a ſort depoſe them?

(2) It will be as well your heavy *judgment*, as your ſin. What a plague is it to be thus alienated from feeding beſides the Shepherds Tents, or to refuſe to go forth by the foot-ſteps of the Flocks (as Chriſt directs) to feed in the Paſtures where he feeds and makes his flocks reſt at noon, *Cant.* 1. 7, 8? will ye not then be ſcorched, wax lean and wither? and be in hazard to turn aſide by the flocks of the Companions? Do ye not then put your ſelves out from under his leading and feeding hand? and tempt the Lord to refuſe to feed you (except it be with wormwood), yea to break his ſtaff of Beauty, ſeeing ye break the ſtaff of Bands, *Zach.* 11. 7, 8, 9, with 10. Certainly, God is the God of order, not of confuſion; of peace, not of jarring: He dwelleth

not in *Babel*, but in *Salem*. Beſides, is not Schiſm and Separation readily the fruit of other ſins, ſuch as *pride*, (Iſa. 65. 5.) *formality*, *wantonneſs*, *waywardneſs*, *&c.* and can that be but a plaguy fruit that groweth off ſo bitter a root? Moreover, does it not (as it were) divide Chriſt and his Heritage into pieces? afflicts his Church and Servants? yea, and tendeth to deſtroy Religion and his Kingdom? and demoliſh them into a ruinous heap? And to ſay no more, where ever this bitter root of rigid Separation does ſpring up, does it not defile many? ſpecially in leading unto error, if not profanity? for as of old it was obſerved, *Omne ſchiſma deſinit in hæreſin*: ſo *Ameſ. caſ. conſc. de Shiſm.* So alſo *Jerom. Comment. on Tit.* ſays, *Every Schiſm leads to error, to patrocinate its ſeparation.* In a word, it is a mother-evil, an inlet to an ocean of other evils.

(3) It will be an *evil ſign*, both Diagnoſtick and Prognoſtick; will it not argue you to be much deſerted of God, and left to your ſelves? and evidence much ſimplicity and weakneſs, if not inſtability and giddineſs, and ſpiritual diſtemper, *Jud.* v. 18, 19. Moreover, what a black *Omen* will it be of Gods forſaking the Land, and being about to give a Bill of Divorce to your Church? is it not as well a fatal-like as an unkindly thing, to ſee the ſheep kicking at, puſhing away, or running from their Shepherds? Certainly it is one of the blackeſt Clouds hangs over you, of malignat influence for the preſent, and (unleſs it be removed) of dangerous conſequence for the future, *Mal.* 4. *ult.*

Upon all which, and the like Conſiderations, we would obteſt, yea charge you in the name of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and by your appearing before him,

him to beware of Schiſmatizing, 1 *Cor.* 1. 10. and 12. 25. *Heb.* 10. 25.

And as ye would hold off ſplitting on this Rock, we make bold to preſent you with, and to intreat you to obſerve theſe rules, beſides what are mentioned in the preceeding Advices.

(1) *Take heed of leſſer differences:* Small Wedges make way for great ones; petty differences (ſlighted) grow up to ſtated Diviſions, and Diviſions to Schiſm and Separation. Therefore (as much as in you lyeth) be preciſe to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, and cruſh the Cockatrice in the Egg, leſt a little leaven neglected, leaven at length the whole lump.

(2) *Affect not, be not too much taken with novelties and new guiſes in Religion.* Itch not after Singularities, nor be dazled with the busked beauty of niceties. Truth and Piety is lovely in every dreſs, no leſs in her old coat than a new. Nothing more leads to ſeparation than new fangleneſs.

(3) *Be tender either of giving, or taking offence.* Be not eaſily ſtumbled, *Mat.* 18. 7. Study Charity, and be apt to conſtruct doubtful matters in your Miniſters, into the beſt part.

(4) *Labour to ſee God in and with them.* And if God be with them, Chriſt ſpeaking in them, how will ye dare to ſpurn at them, and kick them off? If ever ye heard them ordinarily, can ye deny but ye have ſeen it evident, that God was in them, and with them? How oft has ſome of you ſpoken of a bleſſedneſs in their Miniſtry, before ye were put upon your dividing notions, and took up prejudices at them? Have ye not found a Divine preſence and aſſiſtance with them, which made you cry in your

hearts, as *Joh.* 1.29. *Come see a man that has told me all things, &c.* And thereupon been made to honour them in your hearts, and say as 1 *Cor.* 14. 24. *Of a truth God is in them?* Have you not oft been made to say, the Indulged Ministers Preached best to souls cases, though ye said the Field-Preachers spoke best to the Times? Now, how unchristian is it to depart from their Ministry, with which Christ continues yet his presence? Have you any warrant to leave them before Christ leave them? Will ye be stricter and holier than he? Will ye cast off whom the Lord casts not off? When *Jacob* found God in *Bethel*, he set up his Pillar there.

(5) *Beware of having the persons of men in admiration*, either for gifts or grace, or because of advantage, *Jud.* v. 16. This was it which occasioned the Schisms in the Church of *Corinth*, admiring their Teachers, they were puffed up for one against another, and one said, *I am of Paul, another, I of Apollo, others, I of Cephas, &c.* even according as their humour and liking led them? take heed of being taken in the same snare. All flesh is grass, none infallible, and therefore none to be doted upon. *Ne judicemus ex personis fidem, sed ex fide personas*, said *Tertullian*. Let not your eyes be so dazled with whatever eminency of Parts or Graces ye apprehend to be in any, as to set up their bare word for your Oracle, or their example for your rule. This was it which drew many of the *Jews* (and *Barnabas* among the rest) into a sinful Separation, (*Gal.* 2. 12, 13.) because they saw *Peter* a leading man, a prime and eminent Apostle, going that way before them. And yet that Pillar of the Church did therein halt, and walked not with a straight foot, and was to be

blamed;

blamed; and consequently to be not imitated, but shun'd. It is dangerous to shape our course by anothers compass; as many a Ship has been lost and run on Banks by following their Admirals Lanthorn. Give eminent and godly men their due respect, but put them not in Gods room. It is Divine Rule, not Humane Example, we are to walk by. Follow no man further than he follows Christ, 1 *Cor.* 11. 1.

(6) *Take heed of pretending to greater purity and strictness about Church-communion, than the word of God commends, or the examples of Christ, of the Apostles, and the Primitive Church commends.* Nor be so extreamly rigid as not to bear with things they have tolerated. Be not over-righteous, lest by over-straining ye both sin and do harm; yea, and plainly bewray it to be faction or humour, not Conscience, which acteth you. *Calvin contra Anabaptistas*, Act. 2. says, *Cum sub specie studii perfectionis imperfectionem nullam tolerare possimus, tunc Diabolum nos tume facere superbia, & hypocrisi se ducere, meneamur.* Suppose your Ministers were guilty (as they are not) of most of things ye lay to their charge; Yet what an unparalleld, unheard of, unexamplified Separation is yours from them as to any warrantable precedent?

(7) *Make nothing necessary to the unity of the Church, or to the Communion of Pastors and people, but what God has made necessary in his word, or directed you to make.* Put not every new opinion into your Creed, nor every new course be added to the Decalogue; as if ye were to impose them upon, or require them of others, as such substantial Articles of Faith, or necessary duties, that ye must renounce all Religious fellowship with them who are not of that way, *Act.* 15. 10.

15. 10. There is not a greater divider or ſeparater than this tantizing or ſcrewing up of debateable points, wherein God has left us ſo much latitude, as not to make either the one or the other part of the Controverſie, a neceſſary condition of Church-communion. O take no burden of ſtrictneſs on you, that is not of his impoſing, *Rev.* 2. 24, 25.

(8) *Enſlave not your ſelves to any perſon or party, ſo as to be over-deſirous to pleaſe them, or over-fearful of their cenſures.* Is it not ſervile man-pleaſing, and cowardize to do ſo? and leads many to ſinful compliance with dividing courſes? when therefore any fervent ſelf-conceited perſon or people would carry all down by their cenſoriouſneſs and paſſions, it is high time for Paſtors, and the aged, graver, and maturer ſort of Chriſtians, openly to rebuke them, to appear againſt them, and ſtand their ground (as *Paul* did, *Gal.* 2. 11.) and not to comply with the miſguided ſort (though well-meaning), and their prepoſterous zeal, that by connivance or compliance ye may eſcape their Cenſures and Reproaches. He that thus ſaveth his name, ſhall loſe it, and perhaps on a worſe account. Be not therefore cowed to ſilence or *Amen* to their way, for fear of the ſcourge of Tongues. Be valiant for the Truth, and againſt ſuch ills; elſe fainting will feed their humour, and invite them to be more inſolent. Put on Authority and Goſpel-auſterity to check their petulancy and untowardlineſs.

(9) *As well ſhould ye beware of real ills, ſo be not ſcarred from good by the name of evil.* What a trick has ſome of ſtigmatizing things with odious and terrifying names, thereby to boggle ſimple and well-meaning people? If the ratling and canting names of

Eraſti-

Eraſtianiſm, Supremacy, Homologate, &c. falſly applied, ſerve to fright you from Indulged Miniſters, your skittiſhneſs is to be lamented. And it may be ſaid of them as of old the Apologiſt ſaid of Chriſtianity, in like manner branded and bogled at, *Tolle Nomen Criminis, & nihil erit criminis, niſi Nomen.*

(10) *Beware of ſuffering prejudice or fancy to be to you for Reaſon or Religion, or to raiſe in your minds unjuſtifiable diſtaſters at your Paſtors.* Separation is a thing not to be lightly ventured upon. And yet what are oft-times peoples exceptions againſt union with, and pleas for dividing from their Miniſters, but light and frivolous, when weighed in the Ballance of the Sanctuary? yea, ſuppoſe ye ſeem to have Scripture to plead, what if you be miſtaken of the *ſenſe* or *application*, or wreſt the ſame? Be not ſo arrogant as to ſet up your apprehenſions thereof for infallible Oracles. Humble, ſober, ſelf-jealous folk, get uſually moſt of the mind of God, *Pſal.* 25. 9. Whereas the confident are moſt readily in the miſtake, *Prov.* 26. 12, 16.

(11) *Charge not upon your ſelves unwarrantedly other mens faults, but look to your own ways and duties.* Labour to underſtand diſtinctly what it may be on your part, that may conſtitute you a partaker in the ſins of your Miniſters (if any be), leſt through ignorance hereof, ye be led to take improper courſes, & unlawful midv's for avoiding Communion with their (imagined) guilt, and ſo run upon real guilt of your own in ſeeking to ſhun acceſſion to theirs. Suppoſe there be ſome faults in your Miniſters perſonal actings, or in their way of entry to their Miniſtry, or in their Miniſterial Adminiſtrations (ſuch as want of due freedom againſt the evils of the time, &c.)

yet

yet know ye will hardly find a ground in Scripture for it, that your ſimple hearing them, and not ſhaking off their Miniſtry, doth natively render you adopters of their ſin. It is not enough that you and others think ſo, unleſs the Lord conſtruct it ſo, and declare it ſo by the Rules of his word. Now ſearch all the Rules of the Word, wherein he declareth how men communicate in others ſins, and ye will find none of them quadrate with this caſe. Are their (alledged) failings meerly *Perſonal?* ſuch as neglect of duty to their Brethren, *&c.* Theſe (ye know) doth not vitiate their Miniſtry, nor have ye any Communion therewith, in communicating in their Miniſtry; for as your own Divines teach, perſonal faults reſt on the perſon, and doth not pollute the Office. Or, are their faults ſome leſſer failing in the *diſcharge* of their Miniſtry? ſuch as not being ſo ſtee and full in Preaching and witneſſing againſt the ſins of the time, *&c.* do not theſe alſo ſiſt upon themſelves? and not render it unlawful for you to hear them Preach the Goſpel to good purpoſe? Is the Miniſters defect the Hearers ſin? Or, is it not lawful to own the Miniſter who cometh not up all the length we would, in teſtifying againſt publick corruptions, but thorough puſillanimity faints, and falls ſhort? What if you require more than is really expedient? or, what Scripture requireth you to ſeparate from one of that deficiency? To his own Maſter he ſtandeth or falleth; you will not be holden anſwerable to God for it, meerly for your joining in the Ordinances diſpenſed by him, though with that want, eſpecially if ye admoniſh him of his ſhort-coming, *Col.* 4. 17. Do ye not read how defective many of the Angels in the Churches

ches of *Asia* were, in fidelity against ſins of the time? yet not a word from our Lord to People to deſert them therefore, *Rev.* 2, & 3 *Chap.* Or, are their (alledged) faults in the *way* of their coming to the publick, free exerciſe of their Miniſtry? ſuch as neglect of a teſtimony againſt the Eraſtian Uſurpations of the time, which ſome judg to involve them in a conſtructive compliance therewith, *&c.* Yet is not that only their own perſonal guilt? but defileth not their Miniſtry to you. Nor does your joining with their Miniſtry involve you in the guilt of their (ſuppoſed) irregularities or Homologations committed in coming to the peaceable exerciſe of it by the Indulgence. For your participating in the Acts of their Miniſtry does not terminate upon, intermedle with, or natively imply a joining with, or approving of theſe faults (which are altogether extrinſick and accidental to their Miniſtry and its exerciſe, and reſts upon their perſons alone), for ye hear and join with them ſimply as *Miniſters*, and your *Miniſters* being called by you; but not *as ſuch* and *ſuch* Miniſters reduplicatively under ſuch and ſuch Formalities and Conſiderations as ye apprehend to be faulty in them, (even as theſe who *Mat.* 23. 2, 3. heard them that ſat in *Moſes* Chair, whom all know to have entered with many Irregularities, nevertheleſs did not hear them under ſuch notions and reſpects, but ſimply as *Moſes* Succeſſors in the Chair); and therefore your deed involveth you not in any acceſſion unto, or participation in their (pretended) ſin; not inferring or importing (in Gods conſtruction, ſignified in the Rules of the Word) your conſent unto, or allowance and approbation of that their ſin. It is no *cotenancing* of them in their (alledged) ſin, but in their Mini-

Miniſtry ſimply, which ye cannot deny to be ſound and lawful, abſtractly conſidered from theſe ſuppoſed diſorders or defects in their coming by the free exerciſe thereof with you. Ye communicate only with their function, in its *ſubſtance* (which is the *Ordinance* of Chriſt) not in the *nævi adnaſcentes*, or ſinful *circumſtances*. And the more evident yet is the needleſneſs of your ſeparating in this caſe, if ye teſtifie to them your diſſatisfaction with, and diſowning of the (apprehended) tranſgreſſions in their way of coming by the licenſed exerciſe of their Miniſtry; which draweth a line of Separation between you and thoſe ills; and conſequently ſtateth you guiltleſs, albeit ſtill ye imbrace the benefit of their Miniſtry in it ſelf. Neither is this, as ye ſay, *proteſtatio facto contraria*, the proteſtation and deed being not *ad idem*, not relating to the ſame thing, and conſequently doth not croſs and deſtroy one another. Doubtleſs if bare hearing and joining with a Miniſtry, having ſuch *Nævos*, blemiſhes, adhering thereunto, doth make the people Homologaters of, and communicaters in theſe defilements, our bleſſed Lord would never have inſinuate (in *Mat.* 23.2,3.) his approbation of partaking in ſuch a Miniſtry. If further ye ſcruple and think your hearing the Indulged Miniſters may *harden* them in their (deemed) ſin, which to be acceſſary unto thereby, ye judg would be your ſin. We *anſwer*, doth the ſportleſs and holy Lords making his Sun to ſhine, and rain to fall as well upon the unjuſt as the juſt, tend to harden them? what more doth your hearing tend (natively) to harden and encourage thoſe Miniſters? We grant it may be abuſed thereunto (were they in a courſe of ſin as ye ſuppoſe) yet that is but accidental, not natural to your deed, and therefore you are innocent;

nocent; especially your deed being otherwise necessary. Surely it makes you no more guilty of their hardening (in case they harden themselves upon it) nor subjects loyalty and duty to their Prince (who having a righteous title, yet hath used some indirect means to attain possession of the Crown and Government) does render them guilty of hardening him in impenitency for these evil arts used for getting into the Throne. Ought ye not to remember that whatever forbearance of matters of *Liberty* and *Indifferency* (such as intimate personal unnecessary converse, or the like) another mans abuse thereof calleth you unto; yet necessary and weighty duties (such as your keeping Church-communion is, *Heb.* 10. 25.) may not, must not, be omitted upon such a score, of an accidental emergency; for as evil is not to be done that good may come of it; so, nor duty to be left undone, for avoiding such an accidental abuse thereof; else it were in the power of others by their stumbling upon, and abusing of our doing of duties, might vacate us from them all, and so make all the Commandments of God of non-effect; yea, the Scripture it self should be (on that reason) laid by, because many wrest it to their own destruction. If they will harden themselves upon your not separating, your following of duty is meerly the innocent object and occasion thereof; themselves only are the transgressors, because you are purely *passive*, they *active* in the case. Thus ye see, that supposing there were such real faults in your Ministers access to the publick undisturbed exercise of their Ministry as ye talk of, (whereas in sober and unprejudiced search you will find none), albeit these should call you to mourn to God for them, and endeavour their conviction and

reformation, yet not to ſeparation. Since without acceſſion to theſe faults, ye may join with the men and their Goſpel-adminiſtrations; *Lugendum & ferendum eſt, quod mederi nequit*, ſays Judicious and Holy *Calvin*. Be ye therefore *Monitores & Correctores* (if ye can) *non Deſertores*. But bleſſed be God there is in truth ſo far as we can ſee, no juſt ground of ſtumbling at them; ſo, at leaſt as to ſcare you from their Shepherd-tents. And would ſome lay aſide prejudice, paſſion, ſelf-intereſt, &c. and not be over righteous, nor over-wiſe, (which the wiſe *Solomon* dehorteth from in *Eccl.* 7. 16.) nor (by ſcrupuloſity or cenſoriouſneſs) make more ſins than ever God by his Law hath made; nor ſeek a knot in a Ruſh (thorough niceneſs, or timorouſneſs, or captiouſneſs); we perſwade our ſelves your Controverſies would ſoon be at an end, and your terrible Convulſion-fits of dividings and ſeparating, no more overtake you.

But to draw to a cloſe. We ſhall ſay no more, nor had we ſaid ſo much, had not the urgency of your caſe compelled us. Only this we add, that having thus far preſumed upon your patience and candor to ſpeak our mind freely concerning your caſe and carriage, out of Chriſtian compaſſion to your diſtractions and diſtempers, and affectionate zeal to your recovery, we humbly crave you pardon for our freedom: intreating you in the Lord to conſider what is ſaid, *Et agnoſcere quod Dei eſt, & ignoſcere quod hominis eſt*. Himſelf give underſtanding in all things, which concern his honour, the good of his poor diſtreſſed Church and people, and your own duty and peace. And finally, Brethren, we bid you farewell; wiſhing the Prince of Peace, after ye have ſuffered a while, to ſtabliſh and ſettle you. And to him that is able to heal your breaches, to keep you from falling, and to recover the fallen, and preſent you ſpotleſs before the Father, be Glory.

And if in any thing we can ſerve your edification and peace, we willingly ſubſcribe our ſelves,

Your affectionate Friends and Servants in Chriſt.

FINIS.